

MAY 29 1930

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the organs of the Classical Association. The QUARTERLY is published in January, April, and October (double number); the REVIEW in February, May, July, September, November, and December.

# The Classical Review

EDITORS { E. HARRISON, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.  
Prof. W. M. CALDER, LL.D., 5, Derby Road, Withington, Manchester.

All correspondence should be addressed to Prof. CALDER. Books for review should be sent to the Publisher.

## Board of Management:

Prof. J. F. DOBSON, M.A., Chairman.

Prof. H. WILLIAMSON, M.A., Hon. Treasurer.

L. WHIBLEY, M.A., Hon. Secretary.

Prof. R. S. CONWAY, LL.D., F.B.A. With the Chairman, Treasurer, and Secretary, representing the Council of the Classical Association.

Prof. A. C. CLARE, LL.D., F.B.A.

E. A. BARBER, M.A., representing the Oxford Philological Society.

Prof. D. S. ROBERTSON, M.A., representing the Cambridge Philological Society.

With the co-operation of Prof. E. K. RAND, Harvard University, and Prof. W. RITCHIE, University of Cape Town.

Vol. XLIV

MAY, 1930

No. 2

## CONTENTS

	PAGE		PAGE
NOTES AND NEWS	49	REVIEWS (continued):	
CRETAN AND TROJAN ÉMIGRÉS. S. CASSON	52	<i>Cicéron, Des Termes extrêmes des Biens et des</i>	
AESCH. <i>Agam.</i> 1525 ff. A. C. PEARSON	55	<i>Maux</i> , I (Martha). H. RACKHAM	74
THE <i>BACCHAE</i> AGAIN. J. A. SPRANGER	56	<i>Properce</i> (Paganelli). H. STEWART	75
CONFESSIOREM <i>SORICINA NENIA</i> . W. B. SEDGWICK	56	<i>Tito Livio: Ab Urbe Condita Liber XXVII</i> (Cesareo). S. K. JOHNSON	76
THE DATE OF VIRGIL'S DEATH: A NUMISMATIC CONTRIBUTION. H. MATTINGLY	57	<i>Roman Political Institutions</i> (Homo). W. R. HALLIDAY	77
ON PHILOSTRATUS' <i>Lives of the Sophists</i> I. 24. D. C. HESSELMING	59	<i>L'Empire Romain</i> (Albertini). M. CARY	78
THE HOLLOWES OF EUBOEAE. G. C. RICHARDS	61	<i>Apulei Metamorphoseon Libri XI</i> (Giarratano). D. S. ROBERTSON	80
HYPERIDES, <i>Epitaphios</i> , § 20 (Col. 8). D. TARRANT	62	<i>Tertullien, Apologétique</i> (Waltzing-Severyns). A. SOUTER	82
PLAUTUS, <i>Rudens</i> , 109 ( <i>occupatos occupat</i> ). W. BEARE	62	<i>Oppian, etc.</i> (Mair); <i>Athenaeus</i> , II, III (Gulick); <i>Plutarch's Moralia</i> , II (Babbitt). E. HARRISON	82
<i>PRIUS AENEAS</i> . T. C. HAARHOFF	62	<i>Early Christian Latin Poets</i> (Kuhnmuench). S. GASELEE	85
REVIEWS:		<i>The Greek Anthology selected and translated</i> (Leslie). J. U. POWELL	86
<i>Der ethische Aufbau der Ilias und Odyssee</i> (Herkenrath). K. B. ONIANS	63	<i>Greek and Roman Bronzes</i> (Lamb). H. MATTINGLY	87
<i>Heliodora</i> (Hommel). A. W. GOMME	64	<i>A Guide to the Exhibition of Roman Coins in the British Museum, etc.</i> W. M. CALDER	88
<i>Isocrate, Discours</i> , I (Mathieu-Brémond); <i>Isocrates</i> , II (Norlin). M. L. W. LAISTNER	66	SHORT REVIEWS	89
<i>Platon, Le Banquet</i> (Robin). A. E. TAYLOR	68	SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS	93
<i>Excavations at Olynthus</i> , I (Mylonas). A. J. B. WACE	70	BOOKS RECEIVED	94
<i>Ikthus und Akzent im lateinischen Sprechvers</i> (Fraenkel). R. L. TURNER	71		

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.

NEW YORK: G. E. STECHERT & CO., 31-33, EAST 10TH STREET.

Price of the present Number, 2s. net. Yearly Subscription, 12s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$3 Combined Yearly Subscription for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW 25s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$6.25.

## THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.), and there is an entrance fee of 5s. (not charged to Libraries). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and, on payment of 2s. 6d., of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices, provided that the subscriptions be paid before January 31st in each year. Subscriptions sent in later than that date must be at the rates offered to the general public.

Inquiries and applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Mr. H. F. Hose, Dulwich College, S.E. 21; or to either of the Hon. Secretaries, Dr. E. Norman Gardiner, 1, Linton Road, Oxford, and Miss E. C. Gedge, Crayford Rectory, Kent; or to the Hon. Secretary of any of the district Branches—viz., Mr. W. Beare, The University, Manchester; Dr. G. A. Auden, 42, Lordswood Road, Harborne, Birmingham; Mr. R. B. Onians, 35, Mount Street, Liverpool; Professor F. S. Granger, University College, Nottingham; Mr. W. L. Cuttle, The University, Bristol; Mr. Basil Anderton, The Public Library, New Bridge Street, Newcastle-upon-Tyne; Miss E. J. Vaughan, University College, W.C. 1; Mr. L. J. D. Richardson, Fernshaw, Hilary Road, Llanishen, Cardiff; Mr. D. E. F. Binyon, The University, Leeds; Miss A. I. S. Smith, Girls' Grammar School, Bradford; Mr. F. D. T. Jenkins, University College, Aberystwyth; Miss M. E. Lees, University College, Bangor; Miss M. M. Towne, County School for Girls, Beckenham; Mr. T. B. L. Webster, Christ Church, Oxford; Miss C. Keith, St. Hilda's College, Oxford; Miss W. A. Odell, Brighton and Hove High School for Girls, Brighton; Mrs. F. G. Maunsell, 123, University Road, Southampton; Professor F. Fletcher, University College, Exeter; Dr. G. H. Goldsmith, 6, Bromham Road, Bedford; Mr. J. E. Scott, Caius College, Cambridge; Miss N. C. Jolliffe, The University, Reading; Mr. G. H. P. P. Tredennick, 34, Beech Hill Road, Sheffield; Mr. H. Hill, University College, Swansea; and Mr. R. Dobbin, 326, Montreal Street, Christchurch, New Zealand. It is hoped to form a branch at Leicester; anyone interested should apply to Mr. P. Leon, University College, Leicester.

### A CLASSICAL DICTIONARY

OF  
GREEK & ROMAN BIOGRAPHY  
MYTHOLOGY & GEOGRAPHY

Compiled from Sir Wm. Smith's  
larger Dictionaries. Revised by  
G. E. Marindin, M.A. With over  
800 woodcuts. Demy 8vo. 21s. net.

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE ST. W. 1

### BOOKS FOR ALL EXAMINATIONS

NEW AND SECOND-HAND  
CLASSICS A SPECIALITY

### J. POOLE & CO.

86 CHARING CROSS ROAD  
LONDON, W.C. 2.

t and  
upon  
tional  
(c) to  
create

annual  
of 5s.  
dings  
ssical  
ssical  
efore  
must

the  
ither  
Road,  
etary  
rsity,  
nam;  
iver-  
Basil  
Miss  
haw,  
eeds;  
kins,  
ngor;  
S. L.  
ford;  
ton;  
cher,  
ford;  
rsity,  
r. H.  
reet,  
yone

NS

AD





# The Classical Review

MAY, 1930

## NOTES AND NEWS

FROM a correspondent :

'At the General Meeting of the Classical Association held in Cardiff last year it was decided that in years when the Annual General Meeting was held in the provinces a short additional General Meeting should be held in London in January. The first such meeting was held last January at University College, and was by general consent a conspicuous success.

'The meeting began on the afternoon of Friday, January 3, with a meeting of the Council, followed in the evening by an informal dinner at the Florence Restaurant, at which some sixty members were present. On Saturday morning there was a large gathering at University College, where Mr. R. H. Barrow, H.M.I., introduced a discussion on the proposal to publish 'a classical journal suited to the needs of schools and the general classical reader.' Many speakers took part in the discussion. The general feeling was that, while the existing journals catered for the needs of the classical scholar, there was a distinct need for a less advanced publication which would help the increasing number of teachers who were engaged in teaching Latin and Greek in our secondary schools. It was resolved therefore to ask Council to consider the feasibility of instituting such a journal, and, if found feasible, to institute it. The Council of the Association has since appointed a committee to consider this suggestion and report on it.

'The discussion was followed by a delightful paper by Professor F. A. Wright on 'Roswitha of Gandersheim and Medieval Latin Literature,' and a lantern lecture by Dr. Mortimer Wheeler on 'Vestiges of Roman London.' The lecture was a preliminary to a visit to some of the Roman remains in the afternoon. At 2.15 some 130 members and friends gathered at the General Post Office, somewhat to the consterna-

tion of the officials. After inspecting the remains of the City Wall the whole party, led by Dr. Wheeler, started to perambulate the City. They visited the Guildhall Museum, where they were courteously received by the Director, Mr. J. L. Dorthwaite; and the tour ended at the Coal Exchange, where over a hundred pilgrims arrived to inspect the remains of a hypocaust in the basement.

'The General Meeting was held on April 8-11 at the University College of Hull. The place was appropriate, for Hull is the youngest of our University Colleges; and it is in the new universities and schools that it is most important to secure due recognition for classical studies. That the humanities do and will receive generous encouragement at Hull is clear from the welcome accorded to the Association by Principal A. E. Morgan and by the Lord Mayor and civic authorities. 'Lampada ferens' is the motto of the College, and the Principal's speeches left no doubt that under his guidance Hull will never forget that the torch which she bears was lit long since in Greece, handed on by Rome, and so through the ages to us, that we may hand it on as a sacred trust to ages yet unborn.

'One of the first acts of Dr. M. M. Gillies on his appointment as Lecturer in Classics at the University College was to found a Hull Branch of the Classical Association; and this he followed up by obtaining from the authorities an invitation to the Association to meet at Hull. In accordance with precedent the General Meeting should have been held this year in London: but the Council, realizing the opportuneness of the invitation, decided to break with precedent and accept it; and they did wisely. To Dr. Gillies above all was due the success of the meeting. Only those who worked with him know what he did in organizing the meeting and

in ensuring that everything should work smoothly. Moreover, he gave us a delightful sample of his own scholarship in a paper on Apollonius Rhodius, of whom he has made a special study.

'The Presidential Address was delivered by the President for the year, the Archbishop of York. The Association, as a writer in *The Times* remarked, has been singularly fortunate in its Presidents. In the list of those who have held the office are the names of men distinguished not only in scholarship, but in politics, in administration, in the Church, and in science. One can hardly imagine a finer testimony to the value of the Classics than a volume of collected Presidential Addresses; and it is no vain tribute to the Archbishop's forceful and stimulating address to say that it would hold not the least honourable place in such a volume. The title of the Archbishop's address was 'The Distinctive Excellences of Latin and Greek.' Latin literature, he contended, should be studied mainly with a view to understanding Roman history: Greek history should be studied with a view to understanding Greek literature. The distinctions between the two histories and literatures were often neglected in our teaching.

'If in his remarks on the *Aeneid* the Archbishop seemed to some to do scant justice to Virgil, he had himself disarmed criticism by stating at the outset his intention to exaggerate the distinctions between Greek and Latin for the sake of clearness. Anyhow, the balance was restored by Professor R. M. Henry, who came from Belfast to deliver the Bimillenary Lecture on Virgil. To this paper as to the Presidential Address it is impossible to do justice in a few lines. Both will be fully published in the next volume of *Proceedings*.

'In recent years it has been the custom of the Association to invite some distinguished foreign scholar to read a paper at the General Meeting. This year the members were privileged to have from Professor Léon Robin, of the Sorbonne, a paper on the *Symposium* of Plato. M. Robin, who spoke in English, argued that the *Symposium* was written in answer to the pamphlet of Polycrates, and that the occasion

was the death of Aristophanes. After vindicating Socrates against the attacks of both writers, Plato proceeds to theorize on philosophic love, teaching both what it is and what it is not. The *Symposium* is, then, a fiction of Plato, in which he sets forth his own philosophy, but the occasion for it is to be found in the circumstances of the time.

'Of the other papers read at the meeting we can give no more than a bare list, but this will suffice to indicate how varied was the programme. In a paper entitled 'The Shoes of Empedocles' the Rev. C. H. Sharpe showed how much that is best in science, politics, and philosophy was anticipated in the teaching of that philosopher. Professor W. M. Edwards discussed 'The New Fragments of Callimachus,' a subject on which he has already written in the *C.Q.* Dr. Gillies' paper on Apollonius has already been mentioned. Miss A. K. Clarke in a paper on the *De raptu Proserpinae* examined the position of Claudian as a poet. Science was represented by Mr. J. C. Gregory, who discoursed on 'Some Aspects of Greek Science,' and by a lantern lecture by Mr. E. I. Robson on 'Greek Agriculture.' Lastly, Mr. T. Sheppard, Director of the Hull Municipal Museums, gave a lecture on 'Prehistoric Man in East Yorkshire,' and under his guidance the members of the C.A. inspected the Mortimer Collection in the Museum, and visited Beverley Minster and the remains of Meaux Abbey.

'A discussion took place on the Board of Education's pamphlet on 'The Position of Latin and Greek in State-aided Secondary Schools.' The discussion was opened by Miss A. I. S. Smith, and Mr. D. A. Macnaughton, H.M.I., replied on behalf of the Board. The position today was encouraging; the number of those learning Latin and Greek was steadily increasing, especially in the North of England. The difficulty was to provide adequately trained teachers.

'On the last morning of the meeting members learnt of the danger that threatened the Roman Wall. Professor J. Wight Duff, of Newcastle, was appropriately in the chair; and Canon G. C. Richards, of Durham, proposed the

following resolution, which was carried unanimously: 'That the Classical Association, having heard of the proposal to institute extensive quarrying in the immediate neighbourhood of the best preserved section of the Roman Wall, protests against such vandalism, and calls on the Government to take immediate action to save our greatest ancient monument from being disfigured and rendered well-nigh unapproachable.'

'Professor A. C. Clark was elected President for the year, and it was decided to hold the next meeting in London, at Bedford College, in January next.'

The first issue of Proceedings and Selected Papers of the Classical Association of South Africa represents the years 1927-29 and is the fruit of vigorous life. Meetings held in seven cities are reported, and four excellent papers are printed in full: 'The Achievement of Roman Imperialism,' a presidential address by the Hon. J. H. Hofmeyr; 'The Religious Basis of Plato's Philosophy,' by Miss M. V. Williams; 'The Platonic Doctrine of Reality,' by the Hon. P. Duncan; and 'The New Testament and its Place among the Classics,' by the Rev. A. Fox. May Africa send us much more that is as fresh and good!

'To many of us who went to Cambridge in the first week of March it had possibly been the dream of a lifetime to see the *Bacchae* acted. And if the result was not quite the *Bacchae* of our dreams, it was a very impressive, serious, and beautiful thing, which we shall not easily forget: *ὁ τι καλόν, φίλον αἶεί*. The performance was a very carefully thought out and harmonious whole—setting, dresses, singing, dancing, acting, and speaking. Both Mr. Sedgwick in the *Classical Review* and Mr. D. W. Lucas in the preface to his very close but spirited translation (made for the occasion and published by Bowes and Bowes) had told us not to expect a rendering which would take sides in the *Bacchae* controversy or support any theory of the play. What they had not told us, and what was to many of us a revelation, was that Dr. Sheppard and Mr. Burnaby would lay all their

emphasis on the religious element in the drama, and give us a picture of the "revivalist" aspect of the Bacchic worship, which would be deeply moving and even inspiring. This effect was greatly enhanced by the setting of the choruses by Mr. Dennis Arundell to a most beautiful and enthralling adaptation of Handel's opera music. Yet there was danger here. For the effect of this dominating music was to set the key and the *tempo* not merely for the choruses, but for the whole play, and in effect the key was too low and the *tempo* too slow. The "revival" was of the serious Calvinistic order without either the wild joy or the cruelty which Euripides surely intended to associate with his Bacchants: one felt therefore that one half of the argument of the play was barely represented. This result was not counteracted by the actors: Mr. Cohen's Dionysus was beautiful, but not strong nor savage enough; Mr. Wilkinson's Pentheus, though full of vigour, was yet wanting in the dignity which would have aroused sympathy. Agave (Mr. A. J. Hunt) gave us a great thrill at the end of the play, but her hysterical grief on recovery was not sufficiently distinguished from her Bacchanalian triumph. Perhaps the best bit of acting was Mr. Philip's Teiresias: his rationalistic lecture was admirable, and he was well supported by Cadmus (Mr. F. Warre Cornish). The finest speaking in a play uniformly well spoken was that of Mr. A. G. Champernowne, who, in very scanty attire, delivered the Second Messenger's speech magnificently. The singers, especially Mr. Lewis, were delightful; but it seemed a pity that they took no interest in the drama. The dancers were beautifully trained, and some of their movements—notably in the first chorus—most expressive, though the "scrum-formation" was possibly applied too often. It is perhaps unreasonable to complain that one was not given exactly what one expected and wanted, when the gift was undoubtedly a *κῆμα ἐς αἶεί*, for which our best thanks are due to the producers and all concerned. It is good to know that the play drew some full houses—the tide is indeed turning again.'

C. B.

FROM Mr. J. D. Denniston:

'I regret that in my notice of the late Professor Rhys Roberts in the December number I erroneously attributed the Loeb translation of Longinus to him instead of to Mr. W. H. Fyfe: an unaccountable slip, for I myself reviewed the work in the C.R.'

Mr. J. U. Powell and Mr. E. A. Barber have in preparation a book which will

deal in the main with the additions made by papyri to Greek authors who were already extant when the discoveries were made, but of whom the two series of *New Chapters in the History of Greek Literature* did not treat. The book will comprise among other things chapters on Lyric, Elegiac, and Gnomic poetry (Sappho, Alcaeus, Pindar, Bacchylides, and others), Tragedy, Comedy, and Greek Romance.

### CRETAN AND TROJAN ÉMIGRÉS.

THAT the inhabitants of Troy were scattered to the ends of the earth after the destruction of their city is definite enough. Certain Greeks were τῶν ἐκ Τροίης ἀποσκεδασθέντων;<sup>1</sup> these had escaped from Troy with Amphilochoi and Calchas. Of others who escaped with Aineias some were blown as far afield as Sardinia.<sup>2</sup> Others with Antenor founded what was later to become Cyrene.<sup>3</sup> Trojan prisoners of war were found at Tenea<sup>4</sup> in the Peloponnese. The Elymnoi of Sicily, who lived at Segesta and Eryx, were, according to Thucydides,<sup>5</sup> Trojan refugees who 'after the capture of Troy dodged the Achaeans and reached Sicily in their ships.' And so on: for the list of refugees and their destination is a large one, though at the same time it is not every 'Trojan refugee' who belonged to the period of the Achaean siege.<sup>6</sup> There was, after all, the siege of the Second City of Troy, which may have left its mark, and other catastrophes caused by other enemies which had led various people in various places to claim, vaguely enough, a Trojan origin, which was soon and readily identified with the greatest and final catastrophe. Thus the paint-smeared Maxyes of Libya said that they were descended 'from the men from Troy,'<sup>7</sup> though

how or why or when apparently nobody knew. If they were anything like what Herodotus tells us of them they must have left Troy at a time when it had hardly emerged from barbarism, for they painted their bodies red and shaved one side of the head, a custom not, I think, indulged in either by Alexander or by Hector.

But the διασκεδασμός of Trojan refugees is a historical fact amply warranted by reputable evidence.<sup>8</sup> And, as such, it seems to have an interesting parallel at an earlier date. For we hear of Cretans driven hither and thither in the same fashion, though in a more restricted area. In each case they arrive at a destination which, for Cretans of almost any period of history, would be unusual.

The small and remote island of Ikos in the Northern Sporades, now identified as Halonnesos, was settled by Cretans<sup>9</sup> who, μετὰ Σταφύλον διαβάντες ἐκ Κνωσσοῦ ποτε, apparently established themselves safely and then quietly vanished from history. A second island, Pholegandros,<sup>10</sup> was, we are told, called such after Pholegandros, son of Minos. It lies facing Crete, not far from Melos, among the Cyclades.

The Bottiaean of Macedonia were notoriously of Cretan origin. Strabo<sup>11</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Hdt. VII. 91; Paus. VII. 3. 4.

<sup>2</sup> Paus. X. 17. 6.

<sup>3</sup> Pindar, *Pyth.* V. 82 ἔχοντι τὰν χαλκοχάρμαι ξίνοι Τρώες Ἀντανορίδαι.

<sup>4</sup> Paus. II. 5. 4.

<sup>5</sup> VI. 2.

<sup>6</sup> C.R., 1913, p. 153.

<sup>7</sup> Hdt. IV. 191. Their proximity to the Antenoridae of Cyrene suggests that there were two successive arrivals, separated no doubt by a wide space of time, in the same region.

<sup>8</sup> Strabo, perhaps, gives us most information, e.g. Trojan refugees at Metapontum (VI. 2. 15), Siris (VI. 1. 15), Pisa (V. 2. 5), in Venetia (V. 1. 4 and XII. 3. 8), Spain (III. 2. 13), Thrace (III. 4. 3).

<sup>9</sup> Ps.-Skymnos 580.

<sup>10</sup> Steph. Byz. s.v. Φολέγανδρος.

<sup>11</sup> VII., fr. 11. Oberhammer in Pauly-Wissowa (s.v. Bottia) remarks on the appearance of Cretan place-names in Bottiaea, such as



says explicitly that their tale was that they were from Crete, whence they had come under the leadership of a certain Botton or Bouton.

Once Cretans have been discovered settled at Ikos and at the Vardar mouth it seems less surprising to hear from the lips of Alcinous that Phaeacian boats had once conveyed Rhadamanthys to Euboea<sup>1</sup>—*τὴν περ τηλοτάτω φάσ' ἔμμεναι*.

Cretans figured also in Caria. Herodotus tells<sup>2</sup> how Minos and his brother Sarpedon had quarrelled in Crete and how Sarpedon and his party emigrated, or were driven out. Sarpedon established a kingdom there, and Herodotus explains how the tribe Termilai had retained a Cretan tribal name and that the custom of matriarchy survived. To this Carian information we may add a further detail, that at the town of Monogissa in Caria there was a temple of Artemis Monogissene—an *ἱδρυμα Δαυδάλου*. Rhadamanthys is also said to have gone from Crete to Erythrae with his son Erythros, who was its founder.<sup>3</sup>

Further afield and strangely inland, Gaza in Palestine was called Minoa 'because Minos went there with his brothers Aiakos and Rhadamanthys.'<sup>4</sup>

Allowing for a proportion of sheer nonsense to have crept into these tales there yet seems a certain unanimity about them. There was a scattering of Cretans which resulted in the settlement not of carefully selected trading-stations but of rather remote hiding-places.<sup>5</sup> Ikos, most inaccessible and barren of islands, stood on no trade route in pre-Homeric, Homeric or historical times. Bottiaea was in a semi-savage world where trade was hardly thought of until the close of the Mycenaean period, then abandoned

and not thought of again until the time of Peisistratus.

Euboea was visited by strange folk from Anatolia who seem to have established a station there in the Bronze Age,<sup>6</sup> but to envisage it as an island-emporium at any period of early Greek or pre-Greek history would be absurd. The island is no intermediary of trade and no creator of it.

So with Caria, which was as barbarous as Bottiaea up to an equally late period. And Gaza, when the Cretan prehistoric power was at its height, must have been largely a *terra incognita*, peopled with Philistine soldiers waiting for employment<sup>7</sup> and ready to accept the pay of disgruntled princes.

Pholegandros alone may not be a settlement of refugees but rather a trading-station. Though it may equally be either, for the island was known to the ancients as 'Iron island' because it was so hard and stony!

Now in all these stories we hear much of the family of Minos. He had no less than three brothers, one son and a nephew. Minos quarrelled with Sarpedon in the east and with Daedalus (or Cocalus) in the west, where he finally, in the story,<sup>8</sup> met his end. Minos voyaged to Sicily and to Palestine. Rhadamanthys went to Euboea and he went to Erythrae and Gaza, and at Gaza for the first and the last time we meet the unexpected brother Aiakos. Elsewhere Botton, Staphylos of Cnosos, and perhaps Erythros, lead the *émigrés*. The name Erythros is significant.

The evidence is, for the most part, wholly reputable, and it points not to a spread of Cretan trade but only to a spread of Cretan princes. On the other hand, Cretan affairs in Sicily bear another complexion. Herodotus is explicit enough.<sup>9</sup> Minos went to Camicus 'in search of Daedalus,' whatever this may mean. There he was killed, and Cretans sent an expedition to Sicily and besieged Camicus for five

Axios-Axos, Gortynia, and Europos. But these are not highly convincing.

<sup>1</sup> *Od.* VII. 320.

<sup>2</sup> *I.* 173.

<sup>3</sup> Steph. Byz. *s.v.* Μονόγισσα. Paus. VII. 3. 4.

<sup>4</sup> Steph. Byz. *s.v.* Γάζα.

<sup>5</sup> The word *κρησφύγετον* offers attractive ground for speculation in this context. But the temptation is better avoided, for neither the etymology nor the meaning of the word is known. Nor is it likely that, in the form in which it survives, it contains any reference to Crete.

<sup>6</sup> Childe, *Dawn of European Civilisation*, p. 50; Hall, *Aegean Civilisation in the Bronze Age* (1929), p. 81.

<sup>7</sup> Hall, *Klio*, 1928, pp. 335 ff.

<sup>8</sup> *Hdt.* VII. 170 and Strabo VI. 3. 2.

<sup>9</sup> VII. 170.



years. Abandoning the siege, they were blown, on their return journey, to the Italian coast, where they colonised and settled down.

Whatever obscure prehistoric political events lie behind this story we cannot tell. But dynastic troubles, if such they were, led in the end to commerce and to a Cretan control of Southern Italy. Strabo, accepting the story of Herodotus,<sup>1</sup> adds further information. Some of the Cretans, he says, colonised Tarentum and were there in the days of Phalanthus, others 'went on foot round the Adriatic'<sup>2</sup> as far as Macedonia, and were called Bottiaean. Here, I suspect, Strabo has been too clever. Knowing of the Bottiaean Cretans he has explained them by an impossible story, the principal demerit of which is that it gives no reason for undertaking so wild a trip to get at so unprofitable a destination.

The Sicilian enterprises can be sharply distinguished from the rest. They belong to quite a different story. But Bottiaea falls in naturally with the group of stories which give us Cretans in the obscure north-west Aegean. Had Strabo heard of the refugees of Ikos he would, doubtless, have made them too come from Sicily via Bottiaea!

Further, the archaeological evidence, such as it is, testifies to an early and continuous Cretan connexion with Sicily and (less strongly) Italy.<sup>3</sup> But of Pholegandros, Euboea, Bottiaea, and Caria it is significantly silent. Palestine, true enough, has Minoan affinities, but the theory that Philistines were Minoans<sup>4</sup> is hardly tenable in view of recent research.<sup>5</sup> On the assumption

<sup>1</sup> Strabo VI. 3. 2.

<sup>2</sup> How and Wells wrongly say *across* the Adriatic.

<sup>3</sup> Hall, *Aegean Civilisation in the Bronze Age*, pp. 49 and 213; Burrows, *Discoveries in Crete*, pp. 12 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Burrows, *op. cit.*, p. 141.

<sup>5</sup> Hall, *Klio*, 1928, p. 343. Lycians and Philistines are associated and both given a Caucasian origin. Hall thinks that they may have settled in South-West Asia Minor in the third millennium B.C. The Shardana of the fifteenth century B.C. were of the same race, and more recent arrivals from the same regions, at a time when the bulk of the immigrants had reached Syria. Exiled princes not infrequently visit regions where mercenaries are to be found.

that we have two separate traditions, one referring to commerce, the other to refugees, it is only to be expected that small bodies of Cretans flying from their own country would not leave much in the obscure refuges where they settled. Ikos, however, and Erythrae are unexplored and may yet give us something.

In view of the similar character of the Cretan settlements in Bottiaea, Ikos, Erythrae and, apparently, Gaza, it is permissible to interpret the trip of Rhadamanthys in the *Odyssey* as something more than a visit to a friend. What has survived, most significantly, in the story is the belief in the great distance from anywhere of Euboea, a belief which harshly contradicts the cheerful statement that the Phaeacians 'returned the same day.' If it was Cretans who made the trip from Crete, in the original tale, then the account means something, for Euboea lay well outside the range of Minoan navies in the time of the fullest power of Cnossos, in a region which was off the beat of the principal Minoan sea routes. In any case it was at least three days' sail from Cretan ports to the southernmost harbour of Euboea, Carystus.

In these odd tales of Cretan emigrations in the Aegean and the Levant we can, I think, see a process similar to the *διασκεδασμός* of Trojans, after the fall of Troy. And there is only one occasion when such a Cretan *διασκεδασμός* took place, namely the destruction of Cnossos and the chief centres of Crete in the fourteenth century, which resulted in the transference of power from Crete to the mainland and the growth of Mycenaean supremacy. What exactly happened we do not know, but that the reigning dynasties of Cnossos and other cities came to an end we can be certain. The appearance of Minoan princes whose names survive in tradition only as 'brothers of Minos' (or in one case his son) on the periphery of the Minoan world is precisely what might be expected. Amphilocheus, Calchas, Aineias, and Antenor are parallel with Rhadamanthys, Aiakos, Sarpedon, and Minos.

In this context the suggestion re-

cently made by Dr. Shewan<sup>1</sup> that Odysseus himself was a Minoan pure and simple with the curious title of *Ἰθακήσιος*, which distinguished him and his friends from any other inhabitant of Ithaka, is confirmatory of the suggestions here made. The story told by Eumaeus that the beggar came from Crete<sup>2</sup> *ὅθι Μίνωος γένος ἐστίν* may be nearer the truth than even Eumaeus knew, and the knowledge shown by Odysseus of Crete would thus belong properly to him and his

family. Dr. Shewan also points out that the term *ἔδος*, which is used of Ithaka,<sup>3</sup> seems to have the particular meaning of a 'recent settlement.' Odysseus would thus be a descendant of another of these Cretan *émigrés* and Ithaka can, perhaps, be added to the list of their settlements. This conclusion is not, in fact, drawn by Dr. Shewan from the evidence he adduces, but, in the light of what I have suggested, it seems legitimate, in fact almost inevitable.

S. CASSON.

<sup>1</sup> *Classical Philology* (Chicago), October, 1929, p. 335, 'Ithakan Origins.'

<sup>2</sup> *ξ* 522-3.

*New College, Oxford.*

<sup>3</sup> *v* 344.

#### AESCH. AGAM. 1525 FF.

ἀλλ' ἐμὸν ἐκ τοῦδ' ἔρνος ἀερθέν  
τὴν πολυκλαίτην Ἰφικνεΐαν  
ἄξια δράσας κ.τ.λ.

THE words ἀλλ' . . . ἀερθέν have not provoked any considerable discussion, but it is difficult to find in any of the commentaries a clear and logical account of their meaning. Before considering them it may be well to point out that ἔρνος in the sense of *child* is a faded metaphor, and it is unnecessary to attempt to find in ἀερθέν a meaning which fits the original application of ἔρνος (such as Wecklein's *ἄνω βλαστόν*, appropriate to a growing plant. J. P. Postgate, who took this view, kindly reminded me of Pind. *Nem.* VIII. 40 *αὔξεται δ' ἀρετά, χλωραῖς ἐέρσαις | ὥς ὅτε δένδρεον ἄσσει, ἐν σοφοῖς ἀνδρῶν ἀερθεῖσ' ἐν δικαίοις τε πρὸς ὑγρὸν αἰθέρα*. But there ἀερθεῖσ' means exalted by song and belongs to another circle of ideas). That is to say, to speak here of a mixed metaphor to be avoided is to miss the mark. Cf. Pind. *Nem.* VI. 42 *ἔρνεσι Λατοῦς*, Eur. *Bacch.* 1306 *τῆς σῆς τόδ' ἔρνος, ὦ τάλαινα, νηδύος*.

Let us see how ἀερθέν has been explained. Schuetz and Wellauer are practically at one: *filiam meam (progeniem) ex illo conceptam*. But ἀερθέν cannot be the equivalent of *conceptum*. Headlam's 'my sweet branch raised up from him' and Sidgwick's 'offshoot sprung from him' are not free from ambiguity. Blomfield adopts *eductum*,

but unfortunately proceeds to quote Σ 56 *ἀνέδραμεν ἐρπεῖ ἴσος*, which is quite different. Verrall's 'the blossom born of me and him' does not render the Greek. Blaydes is too comprehensive: 'sublime raptum aut educatum enutritum (Angl. reared),' but approaches the truth, while Kennedy's 'scion that from him I nurtured' is somewhat too much limited. Render then: 'My branch begotten of him, her whom I upreared.' The phrase is exactly parallel to *suscipere liberos*, when applied to a woman: Plaut. *Epid.* 561 *filiam quam ex te suscepi*, Virg. *Aen.* IV. 327 *si qua mihi de te suscepta fuisset ante fugam suboles*. Except this, I have failed to find an instance in Greek where the mother is the active party, but ἀναρπεῖν and ἀναρπεῖσθαι are used either of the father or of an outside agent for 'to undertake the charge of . . .', 'to be responsible for the upbringing of': cf. Plut. *Ant.* 36 *παῖδας ἐξ αὐτῆς (Cleopatra) διδύμους ἀνελόμενος*: Ar. *Nub.* 531 *ἐξέθηκα παῖς δ' ἐτέρα τις λαβοῦσ' ἀνείλετο*: Men. *Sam.* 142, 159 *ὅτι τὸ παιδίον ἀνείλετο* of *taking up* a foundling. We find ἀεῖρω in a similar context of Herodes 9. 13 *τοῖς τοκεῦσί σ' ἤειρα*. No one seems to have mentioned this line of interpretation except Pauw, who summarily rejects it: 'non exprimit illud Latinorum *sublatum* de liberis quos pater pro suis agnoscit.'

A. C. PEARSON.

## THE BACCHAE AGAIN.

WHEN one reviews the mass of literature that has been published more or less recently on the subject of the problem of the *Bacchae* and on Euripidean 'problem plays' generally, it must appear that our thanks are due to Mr. W. B. Sedgwick (*C.R.* XLIV., p. 6) for stressing the fact that 'to the audience' of a performance of the *Bacchae* at the end of the fifth century 'no special difficulty would present itself.' That this is true, on the whole, of all the extant plays of Euripides, I am now prepared to admit.

The remaining question seems to be, however, not what the effect of his plays would be on a general audience so much as what the author himself meant to put into them. In other words, how far did Euripides write for the less educated part of his audience and how far for the 'thinking men of his day'?

We may assume that the general effect of his plays on his audiences is reflected pretty accurately by Aristophanes, who had the advantage, in drawing general conclusions as to Euripides' work, of having seen and read many more of his plays than we have.

One of the impressions which Euripides' plays apparently conveyed to his audiences was that, for him, 'the Gods did not exist' (*Thesm.* 450).

Here I join issue with Mr. Sedgwick. He says that 'Euripides is not in the habit of attacking religion: he only, like all thinking men of his day, attacks, or rather discredits by implication, immoral myths and degrading superstitions.'

But those same immoral myths and degrading superstitions were undoubtedly considered, by the mass of his audiences, as part and parcel of their religion. Hence the general impression of atheism which he conveyed.

The average Greek did not see anything unworthy in such myths, and when Euripides attacked them with criticism, as in *Bacch.* 1384, *Hipp.* 120 (σοφωτέρους γὰρ χρὴ βροτῶν εἶναι θεούς), *Herc. F.* 1341 (ἐγὼ δὲ τοὺς θεοὺς οὔτε λέκτρ' ἂ μὴ θέμις | στέργειν νομίζω κ.τ.λ.), *Antiope*, fr. 210 (οὐδὲ γὰρ λάθρα δοκῶ | φωτὸς κακούργου σχήματ' ἐκμιμύμενον | σοὶ Ζῆν' ἐς εὐνὴν ὥσπερ ἄνθρωπον μολεῖν), *Beller.* fr. 292 (εἰ θεοὶ τι δρώσιν αἰσχρόν, οὐκ εἰσὶν θεοί), such criticism doubtless seemed out of place to an audience which, for its own part, felt no moral scruples on the subject.

The mass of theatre audiences does not consist of *συνετοί*, but to the thinking man the criticisms proposed a problem: precisely that of the differentiation of religion from immoral myth and degrading superstition.

I suggest that Euripides himself felt the problem, in common with 'all thinking men of his day,' and that he actually presented various aspects of it for their consideration, as far as he was able to do so, in the *Bacchae* and elsewhere. His methods might only appeal to the more thoughtful section of his hearers and readers, and thus not attract so much notice from the generality of his audiences; but what notice they did attract brought him the probably undeserved reputation of a teacher of atheism.

J. A. SPRANGER.

Florence.

## CONFOSSIOREM SORICINA NENIA.

Si tibi est machaera, et nobis veruina est domi,  
qui quidem te faciam, si tu me irritaveris,  
confossiorem soricina nenia.

(PLAUTUS, *Bacch.* 887 ff.)

So far as I know, these lines have never been satisfactorily explained.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Miss Grace Macurdy's article on the word *sorex* in *J.R.S.* XI. (1921), i. 108 ff., does not deal with this passage.

Commentators have been led into a *cul-de-sac* by Donatus on Terence, *Eun.* V. vi. 23: *egomet meo indicio miser quasi sorex hodie perii*, who explains *nenia* of the particularly shrill squeak of the shrew-mouse *ad quam vocem multi se intendentes quamvis per tenebras noctis transfigunt eos*, quoting the passage of the *Bacchides*.

It is obvious that this explanation explains nothing, as Lambinus in his edition of Plautus saw. Rejecting the explanations of Donatus, and of his own contemporaries Turnebus and P. Daniel, he saw that the clue to the right interpretation lay in the other meaning of *nenia*, 'lower bowel,' which he found in Arnobius, VII. (20) 24: *intestini porrectio per quam proluviis editur* (Arnobius is speaking of a shrew-mouse made of bowels), and compared the similar use of *fartum facere*. But (1) the lower bowel of a shrew-mouse would hardly lend itself to culinary purposes; (2) the use of *confossus* for *concisus* is incredible. Lambinus paraphrases the passage *te magis confossum reddam quam intestinum soricinum cum sorex in muscipula deprehensus certa machina confoditur*, reading more into the Latin than can well be got out of it (what he means by the last three words I do not know).

Lambinus could not have known that the passage was quoted and explained by Festus in a mutilated passage (p. 156, Lindsay), the gist of which may be gathered from Paulus (p. 157, Lindsay). This settles the meaning of *nenia*—we could have no better authority than Festus—and the question now becomes one of zoology.

The ancient zoologists do not seem to help, and the modern apparently know of no such phenomenon as a *nenia confossa* in the animal world. But help comes from a quarter where we should least expect it. A Christian Father put us on the right track, and another, I think, will lead us to the end of our quest. The natural history of the epistle of Barnabas was too much even for the ancients, and is criticised by Clemens Alexandrinus (*Paed.* II. 10); but it seems to provide the requisite parallel to that of Plautus. Proving

that the Mosaic prohibitions had a higher moral meaning, known only to the *τελεία γνώσις*, he reads into the prohibition of hare's flesh a condemnation of *παιδοφθόροι*, alleging in support the following piece of zoological information (X. 6): *ὁ λαγὼς κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν πλεονεκτεῖ τὴν ἀφόδευσιν· ὅσα γὰρ ἔτη ζῇ, τοσαύτας ἔχει τρύπας*.

It would seem that popular belief assigned the same physical peculiarity to both hare and shrew-mouse. If so, we need look no farther for a simple and satisfactory explanation of the line of Plautus. The Romans no doubt gained some idea of the anatomy of the *sorex* from its use in ritual—see Miss Macurdy's article—but what led to this strange error, for error it seems to be, it is hard to see.

W. B. SEDGWICK.

Wyggeston Grammar School,  
Leicester.

P.S.—Since I wrote the above my attention has been called to the fact that this peculiarity of the hare is referred to by Varro, *R.R.* 3. 12. 4, and Pliny, *H.N.* 8. 81 (55)—both from Archelaus—and by Aelian, *H.A.* 2. 12. Sir Thomas Browne (*Pseudodoxia Epid.* 3. 17) explains it by reference to certain external fissures or wrinkles, which are not however connected with the bowel. He quotes Aristotle (*Gen. An.* 3. 6) for a similar formation in the hyena, which gave rise to the belief in its double sex, a belief prevalent in the Middle Ages through the influence of *Physiologus*, in spite of Aristotle's denial, repeated by Pliny, 8. 44 (30). None but Plautus, it seems, refers to the shrew-mouse in this connexion: but the passages quoted show how easily the idea could have been extended to a third animal.

W. B. S.

#### THE DATE OF VIRGIL'S DEATH: A NUMISMATIC CONTRIBUTION.

THE appearance of Dr. Fotheringham's article on the dates of Virgil in the February number of the *Classical Review* has reminded me that the coins may have a small contribution to make to our knowledge. The case, as stated by Dr. Fotheringham, is already so

clear as hardly to need any fresh elucidation; but it may interest Roman students to know that a tribute to the dead poet may have been paid on the coins of the Roman mint in the year following his death.

For the first few years of the reign of



Augustus the senatorial mint of Rome was entirely inactive. In 23 B.C. it began to issue brass and copper, and in 19 B.C., on his return from the East, it issued gold and silver for some six or seven years. We recognise the mint beyond all doubt by the names of the moneyers, the 'triumviri aere argento auro flando feriundo,' which appear regularly on its issues. The first of these moneyers is a certain Q. Rustius, who alludes to the goddess Fortuna of Antium and to the altar to Fortuna Redux, dedicated by the senate to Augustus in honour of his safe return. His date must clearly be 19 B.C. He is followed by a college of three—P. Petronius Turpilianus, L. Aquillius Florus, and M. Durmius—who all refer to the restoration of the standards by the Parthians and to the conquest of Armenia, but have nothing to say of the Saecular Games of 17 B.C. They evidently held office in the year 18 B.C. We do not know on what date these mint-masters entered on their duties; probably their year coincided, more or less exactly, with the calendar year.

All three moneyers strike two series of coins—one with obverse of Augustus and reverse not definitely relating to him, the other with reverse relating to him and alien obverse. Those obverse and reverse types which do not relate to Augustus are still in the tradition of the late Republic, and we know what to expect to find in them. We may be sure that they will contain references to the family history of the moneyers, and also in all probability some hints of the current events of the day. It is with the 'Republican' types of the moneyer Turpilianus that we are mainly concerned. He has obverse types of Liber and Feronia (Libera), and reverse types of lyre, Pegasus, Siren, Pan, a young satyr, Tarpeia crushed by the Sabine shields, and a crescent and star. Some reference to family history is, without any doubt, included here. It has been suggested that the moneyer's family was Sabine in origin, and that the type of Tarpeia was chosen for this reason. Further, the comic dramatist Sextus Turpilius, a contemporary of Terence, may have been counted by the moneyer among his ancestors, and to

him the types of lyre, Pegasus, Siren, Pan, and young satyr may refer. The lyre and Pegasus are obviously suitable, but the appropriateness of Pan and the young satyr is less obvious; and though Turpilius may possibly have been described as a 'Siren,' there is no evidence that he actually was. We cannot but think of the great poet who had just died, to whom these types have such a special appropriateness. He had sung of 'arms and the man,' and the coinage is full of the exploits of Augustus, whom Virgil himself had pointed out as the one who should restore the golden age in the realms once ruled by Saturn. He had sung the praises of Italian country life, of the gifts of Ceres and Liber. The coins show a type of Liber, and a reverse, of the same year, shows the procession of the basket of Ceres, with reference to the taking over by Augustus of the 'cura annonae.' He had sung of the country gods

Panaque Silvanumque senem Nymphasque  
sorores,

and we have the types of Pan and the young satyr to represent the *Eclogues*. And his favourite home had been at Naples, the Siren Parthenope. There surely can be little doubt that Turpilianus, commemorating, it may well be, the fame of his own Turpilius, was pleased to associate it with a tribute to the dead laureate of Rome. Read over again the concluding lines of the Fourth Georgic, and see if they do not chime in wonderfully with the tune of our coins:

Haec super arborum cultu pecorumque cane-  
bam  
et super arboribus, Caesar dum magnus ad-  
altum  
fulminat Euphraten bello, victorque volentis  
per populos dat iura, viamque adfectat Olympo.  
illo Vergilium me tempore dulcis alebat  
Parthenope, studiis florentem ignobilis oti,  
carmina qui lusi pastorum, audaxque iuventa,  
Tityre, te patulae cecini sub tegmine fagi.

The type of crescent and star, which has not yet been satisfactorily explained here, is a type of immortality represented by the crescent moon and star as signs of the sky, to which, in the belief of the time, the souls of the dead were supposed to mount. Augustus by his arms 'viam adfectat Olympo'; but



the poet, none the less, by his 'studia ignobilis oti,' can win his heaven.

There is nothing to add to our story from the types of Florus, but Durmius again has one or two types that have not yet been explained, and may bear some reference to the death of Virgil. On one reverse he has the type of man-headed bull crowned by Victory, the standard reverse type of the former coinage of Naples. And on an aureus he has a type of a butterfly between the claws of a crab, of which no account in the least degree satisfactory has yet been given. It is perhaps not too fanciful to think of the butterfly as the emblem of the soul, and to see in the clutches of the crab a symbol of mortality.

It may perhaps be felt that the death of a poet, however illustrious, is not likely to find a record on anything so official as the state coinage. But we must remember two things—first, that the Romans were quite accustomed to find on their coins many references to the dead, often not of any note except when judged by the partial standard of family piety. If Turpilianus chose to associate with the memory of his own poetic ancestor a more illustrious poet just dead he was breaking no serious rule of propriety. And, secondly, there is evidence to show that even in his lifetime Virgil's fame already stood high. We remember the story of his entering the theatre and receiving an ovation no less warm than that accorded to Augustus himself.

And, finally, one more point suggested by the coins. The moneyers of

18 B.C. seem to have found room in their coins for some reference to the death of the Roman Laureate. The moneyers of 17 B.C. were busy celebrating the inauguration at the Saecular Games of that new age of gold, which he had hymned in the 'Pollio' but had not lived to see. Readers of Virgil in that year must have seen in that poem meanings far more explicit than they could have found in the year when the poem was written. 'Tuus iam regnat Apollo,' 'pacatumque reget patriis virtutibus orbem,' 'cara deum soboles, magnum Iovis incrementum'—how much fuller was the meaning of such phrases when applied, not to a consul and his little son, Saloninus, but to the Emperor, whose special patron Apollo was, who had established the Augustan peace over the earth, and who, since the birth of Gaius Caesar, had an heir, who might rank as the earthly counterpart of the wonder-child, with whose growing the golden age was to advance. The poem, in fact, becomes so exact in its prophecy that the matter-of-fact historian is almost tempted to ask whether we have not here some trace of a rehandling of the old theme in the light of later events; whether Virgil, who paid his tribute to the first hope of the Empire, Marcellus, may not have retouched some phrases, first meant for the son of Pollio, in such a way that no one could fail to think of the second hope of the Empire, Gaius Caesar, son of the Emperor's daughter, and, by adoption, of the Emperor himself.

H. MATTINGLY.

*British Museum.*

#### ON PHILOSTRATUS' *LIVES OF THE SOPHISTS* I. 24.

THERE exists in Philostratus' *Lives of the Sophists* a passage which I think has been misunderstood by the commentators, unjustly suspected and altered by two renowned critics, and wrongly rendered in all translations known to me, even in so valuable a version as Dr. Wright's in the Loeb Classical Library. Long ago I called the attention of philologists to this passage, but my paper, being written in Dutch,

missed its aim.<sup>1</sup> As a right understanding of Philostratus' words has in this case some linguistic importance, I now venture to invoke the help of an international language in order to re-examine the passage.

Marcus, a celebrated sophist of

<sup>1</sup> *De Koine en de oude dialecten van Griekenland* (Verslagen en Mededeelingen der Kon. Akad. van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam VIII (1906), pp. 147-150).

Byzantium, when paying a visit to Smyrna entered incognito the lecture-room of his colleague Polemo; one of the students, however, recognized him, and soon the audience knew who was attending the lecture. So they looked towards him when Polemo asked for themes to be proposed, but the lecturer, judging by the outward appearance of the visitor, whose beard and hair were unkempt, exclaimed: 'Why do you look to the rustic? That man will certainly propose no theme.' The next lines run as follows: 'Ὁ Μάρκος ἐπάρας τὴν φωνήν, ὥσπερ εἰώθει, καὶ ἀνακύψας 'καὶ προβαλοῦμαι, ἔφη, καὶ μελετήσομαι.' εὐθεν ἐλὼν ὁ Πολέμων καὶ ξυνηὶς δωριάζοντος διελέχθη ἐς τὸν ἄνδρα πολλὰ τε καὶ θαυμάσια ἐφίεις τῷ καιρῷ, μελετήσας δὲ καὶ μελετῶντος ἀκροασάμενος καὶ ἐθαυμάσθη καὶ ἐθαύμασεν.<sup>1</sup>

The words I have spaced are rendered by A. Westermann<sup>2</sup> thus: 'Hinc deprehendens eum Polemo et agnoscens dorice loquentem' etc.; Wright<sup>3</sup> translates: 'Thereupon Polemo, who recognized him partly from his Doric dialect,' etc.; W. Schmid,<sup>4</sup> who has consecrated nearly a whole volume to the study of Philostratus' language, explains δωριάζειν as 'dorisch reden'; Thumb,<sup>5</sup> although acknowledging the difference between δωριάζω and δωρίζω as a general rule, prefers 'die dorische Mundart nachmachen, affectiren,' and believes that our passage proves that δωριάζω may be used of 'speaking' Doric. Others have suggested 'Polemo, who understood Doric,' as if for any Greek such special knowledge were necessary to understand the few words that Marcus said!

If these translations are true, the passage of Philostratus bears witness that in the second century A.D. a scholar of renown,<sup>6</sup> inhabitant of an important

city, used the Doric dialect even when speaking to a learned audience far from home.

I do not deny that the old dialects had not entirely disappeared at that time; there are trustworthy testimonies<sup>7</sup> proving that the Doric lived on in the country, but in the towns of importance the Koine had triumphed and Philostratus would furnish the only evidence to the contrary.

Now first of all we should ask how Polemo could gather from the words of Marcus that the speaker used the Doric tongue: they do not contain the least trace of that dialect. Cobet rightly observed: 'Unde tandem ξυνήκε δωριάζοντος?' and consequently doricizing the words, he proposed καὶ προβαλῶ καὶ μελετασεῦμαι, correcting at the same time the unclassical form προβαλοῦμαι.<sup>8</sup> No manuscript supports this conjecture and it is merely based on the belief that δωριάζω can mean 'I speak Doric.' It is, however, a well-established rule that verbs ending in -ιάζω never have such a sense unless accompanied by a word like φωνή;<sup>9</sup> they always signify 'to side with a people,' 'to follow a people's example,' 'to imitate a custom,' in the latter case mostly a fashion in dress. The verbs in -ίζω have a much wider meaning, depending almost entirely upon the context (Rutherford, *The New Phrynichus*, London, 1881, p. 179), and are especially used when speaking of a language, ἀπτικίζω, βαρβαρίζω, δωρίζω, ἐβραίζω, ἐλληνίζω, σολοικίζω, etc.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>7</sup> They are discussed by Sophocles, *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*, New York and Leipzig, 1888, p. 3, by Thumb, *op. cit.*, pp. 29-37, and in my paper mentioned above, pp. 145-152.

<sup>8</sup> *Mnemosyne*, 1873, p. 529. In the eighteenth century Wesseling made a similar conjecture, προβαλῶ μὲν καὶ μελετάσομαι. Wright, receiving Cobet's reading into the text, translates accordingly.

<sup>9</sup> So, for instance, Xenophon, *Anabasis* III, 1, 26: 'Ἀπολλωνίδης τις ἦν βοιωτίζων τῇ φωνῇ, 'a man who spoke with a Boeotian accent or pronunciation.' Apollonides was not a true Boeotian (*Anabasis* III, 1, 31). Sturz in his *Lexicon Xenophontum* is hardly right in translating 'rustico vocis sono utens, pleno gutture loquens.'

<sup>10</sup> Of course Cobet, my venerated teacher at Leyden University, knew all this as well as any one else, but probably he thought Philostratus

<sup>1</sup> Philostratus, ed. Kayser, *Vitae Soph.* I. 24.

<sup>2</sup> Westermann in the Didot edition of *Philostratorum et Callisti Opera* (Paris, 1849) revised the older Latin version (Preface, p. ii).

<sup>3</sup> W. C. Wright, *Philostratus and Eunapius, The Lives of the Sophists*, London and New York, 1922, p. 105.

<sup>4</sup> W. Schmid, *Der Atticismus*, etc., IV, 1896, p. 400.

<sup>5</sup> A. Thumb, *Die griechische Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus*, Strassburg, 1901, p. 32.

<sup>6</sup> Marcus was a contemporary of Hadrian; Philostratus lived from about 170 till 244 A.D. (Wright, *op. cit.* pp. ix-xi).

Holding fast to this distinction we should render the passage, as given by the manuscripts, in this way: 'There-upon Polemo, understanding that he followed the Doric fashion . . . ' This version completely agrees with the preceding text, where we are told that Marcus γενειάδος καὶ κόμης αὐχμηρῶς εἶχεν, ὅθεν ἀγροικότερος ἀνδρὸς πεπνυμένου ἐδόκει τοῖς πολλοῖς. In Athens those who in former times showed by their appearance their sympathy with the Spartan austerity were called by Plato and his contemporaries οἱ λακωνίζοντες, οἱ κομῶντες (cf. Aristophanes, *Birds*, 1282); Cynics and would-be philosophers of a later age attributed the same importance to the wearing of long, unkempt beards and hair, and so did Marcus, with whom rusticity and hairiness (mentioned once more by Philostratus in his *Lives*, II, 18, ed. Wright, p. 253) was intended as a token of his austerity. Apollonius of Tyana shared the same feelings. When reproached for his αὐχμός, he answered: ὦ κακοδαίμονες, μὴ συκοφαντεῖτε τὸ

capable of any solecism. This one, however, does not occur in his works; I am not able to cite from late authors another instance of the supposed use than *Anacreontea* II, 6 (ed. V. Rose): ὁ δ' εἶπε θωριάζων | λάβ' αὐτὸν ὀπίσσω λῆς, where, as Mehlhorn remarks, the four-syllable word serves to save the metre.

Δωριέων εὐρημα· τὸ γὰρ κομᾶν ἐκ Λακεδαιμονίων ἦκει κατὰ χρόνους ἐπιτηδεύθην αὐτοῖς ἐς οὗς μαχίμωτατα αὐτῶν εἶχον . . . concluding his demonstration by exclaiming: σοφοῦ δ' ἀνδρὸς κόμης φειδέσθω σίδηρος (Philostratus' *Life of Apollonius*, VIII, 7).

I imagine Philostratus' account of the meeting of Polemo and Marcus would have been better understood if the author had accompanied the verb *ξυνίημι* by a sentence beginning with *ὅτι* or *ὥς*, as he often does (cf. *Life of Apollonius* II, 21, 38; III, 26; IV, 8, 15, 34, etc.). However, the construction with the genitive denoting the object of *ξυνίημι* is a favourite turn of Philostratus. Of the numerous instances I have noted (many dozens), it may suffice to quote: *ξυνίει αὐτῶν δυσχερῶς διακειμένων* (*Life of Apollonius* VI, 22), *ξυνίει αὐτοῦ ἐξεστηκότος τῷ τυράννῳ* (*ibidem* VII, 10), *ξυνίει τοῦ Συρακοσίου ξυνελαύνοντος . . . οἰομένου τε . . .* *ibidem* VIII, 36).

To wind up my argument, I hold that we have no right to infer from Philostratus' anecdote that as late as the second, or even the third, century A.D. Doric was spoken in Greek centres of civilisation.

D. C. HESSELING.

Wassenaar, near the Hague.

## THE HOLLOW OF EUBOEAE.

DIO CHRYSOSTOM in 'The Hunter' (*Oration* VII. 2) says: 'I was crossing over from Chios with some fishermen after the summer season in a very small boat. A storm arose and we were wrecked on the Hollows of Euboea.' 'Crossing over' can hardly mean anything but crossing the Aegean direct to Greece. If in the open sea a storm arose, the wreck is certainly intended to be on the east coast of Euboea. This raises the question whether this is not an indication of the locality of the Hollows, where Herodotus says (VIII. 14) the Persian squadron sent to circumnavigate Euboea before Artemisium was wrecked. Most moderns have followed Strabo, who puts the Hollows between Aulis (Chalcis?) and Cape Geraestus. Livy (XXXI. 47, 'Euboicus sinus quem Coela vocant'), to judge from his mention of Geraestus in c. 45, did the same, and Valerius Maximus and Lucan can be quoted on the same side. But Stein's note is: 'West of Cape Geraestus the coast turns northwards, and stretches with abrupt descents, numerous precipitous bays and capes for about eight

(German) miles to the coast-plain of Eretria.' But the application of the name to a stretch of coast containing at least seven bays and eight capes is certainly strange. Moreover, Ptolemy definitely places the Hollows between Capes Chersonesus and Caphareus on the eastern side, and I think Dio makes it probable that Herodotus intended this locality. But is a bay intended at all by the phrase the 'Hollows'? Herodotus (VI. 26) speaks of the Hollows of Chios. That certainly seems to be a place on the land where Histiaeus engaged and defeated the Chians before establishing himself at Polichne. The Κόλη 'Οδός of VI. 103 and the deme Koile are in a depression on land.

Other uses of the adjective refer equally clearly to the interior and not to the coast of countries. Thus Homer calls the Vale of Sparta 'Hollow Lacedaemon,' and Herodotus speaks of the interior of Thessaly as hollow. Sophocles similarly speaks of the Vale of Argos, and the country between Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon is Coele-Syria. A suggestion has been made to me by Mr. J. A. R. Munro, which I wish to support, that the term Hollows refers to the plain containing lakes, where lay the town of Dystus

which Wiegand describes as in a *Kesselthal* (*Ath. Mitt.* XXIV.), and where, according to Grundy's map—I have no autopsy—one can pass from sea to sea past two lakes without any great rise in the ground.

I should suggest then that *περὶ τὰ Κοῖλα* in Herodotus meant in the neighbourhood of this region of Euboea on the eastern coast, and that Dio meant the same. As everything indicates Eretria as the *πόλις* in decay described in 'The Hunter,' that is also in agreement with this hypothesis. As there is a large bay on the east side of the 'Hollows' in this sense, and a smaller one on the western side, the application of the name to such bays—Livy's 'Euboicus sinus'—is very natural.

G. C. RICHARDS.

#### HYPERIDES, *EPITAPHIOS*, § 20 (COL. 8).

(OXFORD TEXT.) ἄξιον τοίνυν συλλογίσασθαι καὶ τί ἂν συμβῆναι νομίζοιμεν (νομίζομεν *alii*) μὴ κατὰ τρόπον τοῦτον ἀγωνισαμένον. ἄρ' οὐκ ἂν ἐνὸς μὲν δεσπότου τὴν οἰκουμένην ὑπῆκουον ἅπασαν εἶναι, νόμῳ δὲ τῷ τούτου πρόφ' ἑξ ἀνάγκης χρῆσθαι τὴν Ἑλλάδα; συνελόντα δ' εἰπεῖν, τὴν Μακεδόνων ὑπερφηανίαν καὶ μὴ τὴν τοῦ δικαίου δύναμιν ἰσχύειν παρ' ἐκάστοις, ὥστε μήτε γυναικῶν μήτε παρθένων μήτε παίδων ὕβρεις ἂν ἐκλείπτους ἐκάστοις καθεστάναι.

In the last phrase the older texts give *ἀνεκλείπτους*. But a word of negative sense is required. To read *ἀν ἐκλείπτους* introduces, as Kenyon says, a *verbum ignotum*; also the late return to *ἀν*, in a clause dependent on *ὥστε*, seems awkward and incorrect. I suggest as a possibility *ἀνεπιδείκτους*. For the word, cf. *C.I.G.* 3073. 172. For use of *ἐπιδείκνυμαι* in reference to *bad* qualities, cf. (e.g.) Isocr. 396b, *ἐπιδείκνυνται τὴν ἑαυτῶν πονηρίαν*.

DOROTHY TARRANT.

Bedford College,  
London.

#### PLAUTUS, *RUDENS*, 109 (*OCCUPATOS OCCUPAT*).

LINDSAY (*Syntax of Plautus*, p. 79) refers to 'the curious phrase in *Men.* 452 *qui homines occupatos occupat* (=reddit).' The phrase recurs in *Rud.* 109,

qui oratione hic occupatos occupes,

where Sonnenschein takes it in the same way, referring to *Capt.* 441 (*inuentum inueni*), where Brix again cites *perditum perdamus* from Cicero (*ad Fam.* XIV. 1. 5). Now in the *Menaechmi* passage Peniculus is lamenting his loss of time (and more than time) when attending a public meeting. He invokes a curse on the man who first devised the holding of such meetings:

qui illum di omnes perduint quei primus  
<hoc> commentus est,  
contionem habere, qui homines occupatos  
occupat!

and goes on to say that *otiosi homines* would be more suitable for that sort of thing.

But if we follow Lindsay we get no contrast; 'making men busy' is indistinguishable from giving the *otiosi homines* something to do. On the other hand if (with Nixon) we translate 'to busy busy men' we get satisfactory sense.

In the *Rudens* passage (left unexplained by Marx, who regards it as spurious), if we take *occupatos* as predicative, we are left without any object for the verb. Also the sense seems rather weak: 'Confound you for busying with your talk <us>.'

Sceparnio is extremely anxious to get on with the job of repairing the cottage: this has already been made clear in line 96, and his impatience at being interrupted is again brought out in lines 122-3. If, therefore, we again give full force to both *occupatos* and *occupes*, we can translate: 'Confound you for bothering people here who are bothered enough already.' This is echoed by Daemones' words (l. 121),

dabitur opera, atque in negotio.

W. BEARE.

University of Manchester.

#### *PIVS AENEAS.*

THOUGHTS on the lines of Professor Anderson's paper *SUM PIUS AENEAS* (*C.R.* XLIV., p. 3) had been forming in my mind for some time, and he seems to me to have uttered a well-merited rebuke to Charles Fox's 'Can you bear this?' and its copious progeny.

I should like to add that the position of the adjective in this phrase deserves attention. It is 'prepositive,' in Professor Naylor's phraseology, and therefore (as he has amply demonstrated in the case of Horace) it bears special emphasis. It is always used by Vergil in this position: 'Aeneas pius' is as unthinkable as 'pius Antoninus.' And it is so used because, apart from the reproach it contains against the gods in the passage noted by Professor Anderson (l. 378), it also marks Aeneas everywhere as the national hero of the Romans, whose Stoic sense of duty to family, fatherland, and gods Augustus was trying to restore. There is also, of course, the traditional reason for the epithet—the saving of Anchises; and it is doubtless true in a minor sense that 'pius' was Aeneas' epic card of introduction to the reader ('the Aeneas of the famous Anchises story') as *πολύτροπος* was in the case of Odysseus.

It is notable that in the first book the words 'pius Aeneas' occur at least three times (at 220, 305, and 378), while at 544 Ilioneus refers to him as 'rex . . . Aeneas . . . quo iustior alter nec pietate fuit, nec bello maior et armis.' He is stamped from the first as the national hero, comparable to the man of character whom Vergil admires in the famous simile (l. 148), who exemplifies the Roman virtues of *pietas*, *gravitas* and *virtus* (*pietate gravem ac meritis si forte virum quem*).

T. J. HAARHOFF.

Johannesburg.



## REVIEWS

## THE ETHICS OF HOMER.

*Der ethische Aufbau der Ilias und Odyssee.* VON ROLAND HERKENRATH. Pp. 384. Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh. 1928. Paper, M. 7.50 (bound, M. 9).

THE child of today is not introduced to the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey* that he may improve his morals. For centuries the Greek boy was, though not for that alone. For Horace still Homer was the prince of moral teachers, better than the best professionals, philosophers Stoic and Academic. A side of the poet which the ancients felt so deeply deserves a closer study than it has hitherto received. Such is Professor Herkenrath's last labour. Others have analysed and appraised the morality implied in the poems: he seeks rather to trace how far the poet is moved by and employs the general moral idea that righteousness is rewarded and wrong-doing punished. Book by book and almost line by line he shows the working out of *τίσις*, pointing the moral as he goes and summing up the major issues. The finding of 'ethical unity' has obvious relevance to the 'Homeric question,' and this work falls naturally into place beside the 'aesthetic' arguments of Drerup, Rothe, and other modern unitarians. The poet, it is claimed, having selected his material with an eye to its moral effectiveness, built each poem as a living example and fulfilment of the general law, and achieved a manifold organic unity whose end is necessary to its beginning and all the links between morally interdependent. The law of retribution drives the action forward 'till every sin is atoned for and every virtue rewarded. Then, and not till then, does the movement come to rest.'

In this there is an element of indisputable truth, and the frequency with which it has been neglected justifies Professor Herkenrath in his advocacy, which is at once skilled and patient. But there remain a few points where other valid and less favourable canons deserve to be remembered, and

others again where authorship is not in question but the pleader presses beyond the mark, explaining too much by ethical motives in the poet and straining the moral argument—e.g., 'The ethical structure is the key which has opened the Greek *Märchenwelt* and the Kingdom of Hades to the epic' (p. 347; cf. 355 f.). Homer's narrative can be strangely re-interpreted to provide his heroes with sins that deserve their subsequent disasters. Nestor says that Odysseus turned back at Tenedos from his homeward voyage in order to rejoin and please Agamemnon who had stayed behind (*Od.* III. 162 ff.), and Odysseus himself tells the Phaiakians that a wind drove him from Troy to Ismaros and the Kikones (*Od.* IX. 39 f.), but Professor Herkenrath says that Odysseus could not have changed his mind and intended to go back to Agamemnon at Troy. No, he deliberately took the direction to Ismaros. Lust for adventure and booty were his motives. Thus he sinned by ignoring the angry gods and his duty to parents, wife, and child, and his kingdom (p. 186 f.). Another weakness is that the moral standards, which obviously differ on many points from our own and by which an act must be judged as right or wrong within the poems, are not themselves first established, but a few points are summarised towards the close (pp. 328-9). A single poet is credited with both poems, amongst other reasons because both have the same moral outlook and conception of the gods and fate, stressed as 'unique' (p. 357 ff.). Certain slight yet clear differences of moral code deserve to have been noted (cf., e.g., *Od.* XXII. 411 f. with the attitude of the heroes in the *Iliad*). The moral government of the world is examined, but it is wrongly concluded that the gods are only the subordinate instruments of the will of Moira (pp. 338 ff.). That will, we learn (p. 340), is always done, though *Il.* XVI. 780 and, still more difficult, *Od.* I. 34 ff., are not explained away, and the latter is actually translated elsewhere (p. 178): 'So nahm



jetzt Aigisthos, dem Schicksal entgegen, die Gattin Agamemnons zum Weib.'

Though tending here also to overstatement, Professor Herkenrath makes shrewd observations on points of detail incidental to his main theme. In face of the sympathy that is usually lavished upon Hector he points out the guilt that is forgotten. Despite preoccupation at such length with the moral aspect of things, by his enthusiasm he

himself escapes dullness, and he shows admirably how Homer's 'ethical structure' contributes to the interest and pleasure of the reader, keeping him in a state of tension and expectancy as to the manner in which justice will be done, and giving him a clue and clear vision in the maze of each poem's development and at the close, when equilibrium has been attained, a sense of completeness and deep content.

R. B. ONIANS.

### HELIAIA.

*Heliaia: Untersuchungen zur Verfassung und Prozessordnung des athenischen Volksgerichts, insbesondere zum Schlussteil der 'Αθηναίων Πολιτεία des Aristoteles.* Von F. HOMMEL. Pp. viii + 149; 2 illustrations. Leipzig: Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1927. (Philologus: Supplementband XIX, Heft ii.) Geh. Rm. 12; geb. Rm. 14.

THIS is a very valuable piece of work. Dr. Hommel has given us the first account at once clear and reasonable (and helped by the necessary illustrations) of the complicated process by which Athenian jurors were chosen and drafted into the different law-courts and of the procedure followed in the trial; and therefore the first consistent text and explanation of cc. 63-69 of the 'Αθηναίων Πολιτεία. He has studied (apparently to exhaustion) all the previous literature, and gives a conspectus of it; he values correctly the work of Photiades, which is too little known. Most of his new readings and his suggestions for filling the gaps in cc. 67 and 68 are good; some of them excellent. (They are most of them accepted, and all recorded, by Oppermann in the latest Teubner edition.<sup>1</sup>) Among the best are *ἐξοδον* for *εἰσοδον*] 63. 2, τῷ ἀριθμῷ δ', [ἓνα εἰ] ἐκάστων τῶν δικῶν 67. 1, ἐντὸς [β] for ἐντὸς [α] 67. 2, λα[βομ]ος (= λαβόμενος) for λα[βὼν ἄμα] 68. 4, and his conjectures for the gaps in 67. 4; good also are his explanations of *ὑδρίαί δύο* (63. 2) as two for each *phyle*, of 59. 1 (the duties of the thesmothetes) in relation to 59. 5

and 66. 1, of 64-65. 1 as a process to be repeated ten times, once for each *phyle*, in distinction from c. 63 and 65. 2, and of 67. 1-2 (the procedure in private lawsuits). Hommel gets a consistent picture, and his careful argument is well-ordered and easy to follow.

Not that we get as a result a satisfactory narrative in Aristotle. Nothing in the 'Αθηναίων Πολιτεία is satisfactory. In spite of the mass of detail in these chapters, Aristotle leaves us in the dark in some important matters, and lets us find out others for ourselves, with difficulty and still some uncertainty. He tells us, for instance, nothing of the procedure in private suits with juries of 201, and leaves Dr. Hommel to prove (from 53. 3) that the account in c. 67 must refer only to cases involving 1,000 dr. or over, and juries of 401 (the opening words of c. 67 leading us to think the opposite). No one would suppose from the context that *ἐξοδον* is to be read in 63. 2, and that *ὑδρίαί δύο* means two for each *phyle*; yet Hommel must be right, and there is similar confused writing elsewhere in 'Αθ. II. Nor is it clear what was the purpose of the two *κληρωτήρια* (63. 2, and 64)—but Hommel is probably right—nor of the *ἐμπήκται* and the *κανονίδες*, though it was presumably to facilitate the counting of the 300-400 of each *phyle* who may have turned up to take their chance of selection. Aristotle tells us the elaborate precautions taken that everyone should vote and should know how to vote; but what happened if, for any reason, a vote was invalid (it must have occurred sometimes)? And if all juries were of odd

<sup>1</sup> Cf. C.R. 1928, p. 224.

numbers, and every juror had to give a vote (as Hommel assumes), what was the point of the law that equal votes meant acquittal? Was it only a survival, or was a juror allowed to put both his votes in the ἀμφορεύς ἄκυρος (it was only the ἀμφορεύς κύριος which had a slot so narrow as to take only one vote at a time—68. 3)? There are a number of other points which Aristotle leaves obscure.<sup>1</sup> He has wise words in the *De Partibus Animalium* (A 5. 644b 22) on the right method of dealing with a subject—ὁλον περὶ οἰκίας, ἀλλὰ μὴ περὶ πλίνθων καὶ πηλοῦ καὶ ξύλων. Here he not only deals with nothing but the bricks and the mortar and the timbers, but leaves out much of them, and confuses what he gives. Hence the value of Hommel's work.

But as to some of Hommel's suggestions there is room for doubt: he follows Thalheim in reading <ἀποτιθέασιν> 65. 3 instead of Kenyon's <ἔχοντες καθίζουσιν> and [τὰ σύμβολα] for [τὰς βακτηρίας] 68. 2 (as does Oppermann), forgetting what Kenyon and Photiades remembered, that in the event of a second vote, in *τιμητοί*

ἀγῶνες, the jury receive back the βακτηρίαι (69. 2). His restoration of the corrupt sentence 65. 4, ἀποδιδόναι τοῖς δικασταῖς ἐν ἐκάστῃ τῇ δικαστηρίῳ ἀριθμῷ <πέντε>, with the transposition of τὰ πινάκια after ταῦτα in the line before, is not more convincing than others. 67. 5 ἐν δὲ τοῖς [πρότερον χρόνοις ὅδ] αὐτῷ [τι] ἐξέειλε τῷ διαψηφισμῷ τῷ δευτέρῳ — 'dass es sich wieder um frühere Zustände dreht, scheint mir aus dem Tempus von ἐξέειλε erschlossen werden zu müssen' (pp. 92-3): on the contrary, a reference to a past custom would call for the imperfect, as ἔσπευδον just above, and that this particular one is practically contemporary with the Ἀθ. II. is shown by Aeschines III. 197 (quoted by Hommel, as by others); ἐν δὲ τοῖς [τιμητοῖς ἀγῶσιν] is much more probable.<sup>2</sup> It is doubtful if the διαμετρημένη ἡμέρα was used in all public cases, as Hommel argues; for why the special name? And ὅσοις πρόσσεστι κ.τ.λ. 67. 5 does imply that in some it was not used. I do not believe that one described as ὁ εἰληχῶς ταύτην τὴν ἀρχήν (65. 2) could be anything but a citizen; Hommel thinks he was one of the ὑπέρηται δημόσιοι; Kenyon in his translation rightly distinguished them.<sup>3</sup>

Dr. Hommel (unlike Aristotle) treats of the building, and not of the separate bricks, and in historical fashion; the last third of this book deals with the *dikasteria* before Aristotle. He insists rightly (as did Teusch) that the procedure of 325 B.C. is the result of a long development; that we must not, without other evidence, assume that what

<sup>1</sup> There are others of these obscurities which H. does not sufficiently discuss. He notes, for example (p. 107), that we do not know how the jury voted when there were more than two parties to a case (e.g. Isaeus XI., Dem. XLIII.); but, what is more important, we do not know how the time was allotted between them, and how this affected the other cases to be tried on the same day. Nor does he see the full implications of his conclusion (which in itself seems right) that on one day only private cases were heard, and that in each court of 401 one of each of the four kinds of cases allowed by law (over 5,000 dr., between 2,000 and 5,000 dr., between 1,000 and 2,000, and a *διαδικασία*) was heard. For different archons had to preside at different kinds of trials; in settling, therefore, which private cases were to be put down for trial on a certain day, the archons had to find not only an (approximately) equal number of cases of each of these four kinds, but also the right number to be tried before a particular archon, and not to leave over, for example, a large number of cases of between 1,000 and 2,000 dr., all of which had to come before the polemarch.

It is also difficult to understand the purpose of the βακτηρίαι plus the two kinds of σύμβολα used in the law-courts. But doubtless it was not more unnecessary than our own procedure with passports, when, before embarking, we show them to one official and receive a card which ten seconds later we give up to another.

NO. CCCXXV. VOL. XI.IV.

<sup>2</sup> Hommel (p. 107) regards the procedure in *τιμητοὶ ἀγῶνες*, by which the jurors had only to decide between two penalties, proposed by the prosecutor and by the defendant, as a special weakness of the Athenian system. But it was unavoidable; a jury of 500 could not debate among themselves what penalty to assess, at least not without inordinate delay. The weakness was mitigated by the rule that the penalties had to be proposed when the action was first tabled before the archon; there could be no alteration of it in the law-court, according to the mood of the jury.

<sup>3</sup> On 64. 1 [δια]σείσαντος or [τότε] σείσαντος τοῦ ὑπηρέτου, H. notes that the servitor must have carried the boxes inside before this, a more important action than the shaking. I am inclined to conjecture εἰσενέγκαντος.

was true of that time was true of any preceding period. He is also a man of sense, who does not believe (for instance) that several thousand Athenians spent every day of their lives in the law-courts. Yet as a historian he has a serious weakness, shared by many—an inability to value certain kinds of evidence. He holds that in the fifth century 6,000 men were chosen every year as jurors, and from this number those required on any one day (never more than 5,000) were selected. He may be right; some attractive reasons in support of this view have been put forward by Bonner and S. B. Smith. But to say that it is certain because of Aristotle's express statement in c. 24. 3, and that this is supported by *Vespae* 661 f. and Andoc. i. 17 is wholly to misunderstand the evidence. No single statement in the rhetorical c. 24 should be accepted without close examination; and this one is in all probability itself based on the passage in *Vespae*;<sup>1</sup> and the 6,000 of Aristophanes need be no more accurate than his 1,000 cities of the empire, or his implied statement that every one of the 6,000 sat every day in the law-courts; while Andocides is referring to a very special case, in which all of the 6,000 must be initiates in the Eleusinian mysteries.

Similarly *Vesp.* 233 f. gives no support to the view that the ten sections of jurors did not correspond to the ten *phylae* (as scholiasts and lexicographers said they did, perhaps misled by *Æth.* II. 63. 4); Philocleon must be allowed friends in another *phyle*. Nor should *Plut.* 464-7 be taken too literally (as evidence of a change in procedure); nor too much

stress be laid on the story of Anytus' bribing the jury, even if it is true. Hommel argues that in the fifth century each section of the jurors was allotted to a particular law-court for a whole year (how, if there were fewer than ten courts in constant use?), that Anytus therefore knew who were to try him, and that the system was altered (probably in 403-2) because of this. But the assigning of jury-courts to the different archons by lot at the last moment may (for all we know) have been in existence then, and at least would have served as a simpler change; and in any case Anytus' crime was committed at a time of great disorganization at Athens, when no system, however elaborate, would have been a complete safeguard.<sup>2</sup> That in many of the extant speeches much irrelevant matter (as we think) is introduced is no proof that the regulation mentioned in c. 67. 1 (*διομνύουσιν οἱ ἀντίδικοι εἰς αὐτὸ τὸ πρᾶγμα ἐρεῖν*) is a new one, though the apparent anxiety of Euxitheus in Dem. LVII. (59, 60, 63, 66) suggests that it was new or renewed then. We do not in fact know enough to justify any conjectures in detail of the development of the dicasteries in the fifth and early fourth centuries. Finally, Hommel does right to see in all these complicated regulations a proof of what is so characteristic of the Greek race—mutual suspicion: every chance of fraud had to be guarded against, doubly and trebly guarded. But even this must not be exaggerated: study the laws of bridge and their history.

A. W. GOMME.

<sup>2</sup> Dem. XIX. 1 should also be discussed in this connexion.

#### ISOCRATES.

- (1) *Isocrate, Discours.* Texte établi et traduit par GEORGES MATHIEU ET EMILE BRÉMOND. (Collection des Universités de France). Tome I. Pp. xi+201. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1928.
- (2) *Isocrates.* With an English translation by GEORGE NORLIN, Ph.D., LL.D. (The Loeb Classical Library, No. 229). Vol. 2. Pp. viii+541.

London: William Heinemann, Ltd.; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1929. Cloth, 10s.; leather, 12s. 6d. Of the two editors of the Budé *Isocrates*, M. Mathieu is already known as the author of an edition of the *Philippus* and of an excellent monograph, *Les Idées politiques d'Isocrate*. In their edition the speeches are being arranged in chronological order, so that Vol. I.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *C.R.* 1926, p. 8.

contains the six forensic speeches (XVI. to XXI. in the traditional order), the *Contra Sophistas*, the *Laudatio Helenae*, and the *Busiris*. In addition they have included the exhortation *Ad Demonicum*, whose Isocratean authorship they deny in an introduction of some length. Here we miss a reference to the important observations of Werner Jaeger (*Aristoteles*, pp. 58 ff.) on the parallels between the *Ad Demonicum* and the *Protrepticus*. The basis for their text is Urbinas (Γ), a photographic reproduction of which was at their disposal; but they have also made extensive use of the collations of earlier editors. The result is a conservative text, nearer to Drerup's than to that of Blass. Occasionally MM. Mathieu and Brémond's judgment may arouse doubts or even dissent. Thus, in XXI. 13 they read with Auger *περὶ τοῦτ' εἶναι Νεκίαν*: Drerup's *παρὰ τοῦτ' εἶναι Νεκία* is cited in the *app. crit.*, but without any allusion to the cogent arguments of that editor in favour of his reading. Similarly, in XVIII. 5 ff., Drerup has given good reasons, ignored by the French editors, for supposing that the name of the king archon was Prokles, not Patrokles; while *ibid.* 6 there seems no adequate reason for abandoning the MSS. reading *ἀμφισβητούντες δὲ περὶ* in favour of Benseler's conjecture *ἀμφισβητούντος δὲ*. In the early sections of XVII. we find the authority of Dionysius preferred to that of ΓΕ or even to the consensus of MSS. In I. we welcome the fact that the drastic and unjustified emendations of Blass have been eliminated; but why has *γνώμην* in § 34 been preferred to the *γνώσιν* of ΓΕ (*cf.* Drerup *ad loc.*)? In X. 16 all the previous editors seem right in retaining the vulgate reading *ἔδωκεν* instead of *δέδωκεν* (ΓΔΕ), which in the context is exceedingly harsh.

For the translation one can have nothing but praise. One need only read the rendering of the famous praise of beauty (*Laud. Hel.* 54-58) to realise that this is elegant French prose, which nevertheless is always faithful to the spirit and meaning of the author. The general introduction, forewords to the individual discourses, and occasional footnotes, afford adequate and reliable

help to the reader. There are a few misprints, mostly trifling, but the following are more serious: *Laud. Hel.* 5, *τὸν* has dropped out before *βλῶν*; and in 12, *τὰ* before *τοιαῦτα*. In 23, *αὐτοῦ* should be *αὐτοῦ*; similarly, for *αὐτῶν* in 50 read *αὐτῶν* in both cases.

The first volume of President Norlin's edition was noticed in this *Review*, Vol. XLII. (1928), pp. 223-224. In the second he has grouped together 'the discourses . . . which deal more particularly with the domestic and foreign policy of Athens, and with his (Isocrates') own life and work in relation thereto'—namely, the *De Pace*, *Areopagiticus*, *Contra Sophistas*, *De Permutatione*, and *Panathenaicus*. Vol. II. shows the same excellences as its predecessor; it is also marred by similar faults. The translations are almost uniformly good and the introductions on the whole adequate, though those to *De Permutatione* and *Panathenaicus* are too brief. By a strange error, on p. 369 the publication of the *Archidamus* is put in 346, although in Vol. I. the correct date, 366, had been given. It must be said again that President Norlin is not too successful as a commentator; especially in the *De Permutatione* and *Panathenaicus* is this apparent, presumably because for those two works he had fewer predecessors to consult. A few instances must suffice to justify this criticism. On p. 256, note *b*, the reader is told of Lysander 'that he happened to be in command of the Spartan forces when the Athenian empire crumpled at the battle of Aegospotami,' a statement that is neither accurate nor well expressed. To say, without qualification, 'a drachma was the standard wage of a day-labourer' (p. 344), is misleading. Even if this estimate be accurate for the second half of the fifth century, it is not so for the fourth. What is the point, in a note on the Confederacy of Delos, of a reference to Thucydides 5, 18 (p. 414, note *a*)? It is news to hear that Conon in 394 had a fleet of his own, for on p. 438, note *a*, we hear of the 'joint fleets of Conon . . . and Pharnabazus.' If it seemed desirable, in connection with *Panath.* 132, to allude to the Platonic and Aristotelian classifications of constitutions, reference



to the *Republic* and to the third book of the *Politics* is not enough. Plato's views in the *Politicus* and Aristotle's additional, and in part divergent, remarks in *Polit.* 6 should also have been given. No general reader, seeing the statement that the election of the archons by lot 'is at least as old as Solon' (p. 117), would surmise, what is the fact, that the whole question of lot *versus* election is highly controversial. Moreover, the latest authority inclines to the view

that archons were chosen down to 487-86 (cf. Busolt-Swoboda, *Griechische Staatskunde*, pp. 842-43 and footnotes). Has not Ephorus—perhaps Androtion too—as much right as Theopompus to figure in note *d* on p. 372? And, finally, has not that writer a strange view of Athenian history who can inform his readers that 'Athenian democracy since the days of Cleisthenes lived in continual fear of revolution' (p. 362, note *a*)?

M. L. W. LAISTNER.

### THE BUDÉ SYMPOSIUM.

Platon. Tome IV., 2<sup>e</sup> partie: *Le Banquet*. Texte établi et traduit par L. ROBIN. (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1929. 25 frs.

PROFESSOR ROBIN'S text and version of the *Symposium* have the high qualities to be expected in the work of so admirable a Platonic scholar. The text is very properly, as the editor calls it, a 'highly conservative' one, is constituted with ample knowledge of all that has been done on the dialogue in the textual way, and documented not only by a copious *apparatus* of MSS. 'lections,' including those of Cod. Vindobon. 21, besides, of course, those of the Oxyrhynchus papyrus fragments, but also by an almost over-generous supply of 'emendations' of the *docti*, mostly of the type which has now been definitely antiquated by the advance of palaeographical knowledge. The translation—to a British reader, at any rate—appeals as itself prose of a rare order of literary merit, besides being unusually accurate in minor matters as a rendering. The long *Introduction* analyses the dialogue, discusses the doctrines of Eros maintained by the several speakers, and their interrelations, as well as the relation of the *Symposium* to Plato's work as a whole, and its *rhetorical* interest, with eminent acuteness and lucidity. I do not think it would be too much to say that the book is not only far the best edition of the dialogue in existence, but also one of those rare works which really deserve to be called 'indispensable.' Henceforth any student who theorises about 'Platonic

Eros' without having made a profound study of these pages will be simply putting himself out of court.

Perhaps I may be allowed to make a few remarks about some of the points on which I do not feel that the last word has yet been said. First as to matters of text. M. Robin hardly introduces any new conjectural readings, though in several places he adopts a changed punctuation which appears to me sometimes a certain, sometimes a doubtful, improvement. Thus I doubt about his punctuation at 175*d* 5 ἡμῶν ἐὰν ἀπτόμεθα ἀλλήλων (without the customary comma after ἡμῶν: the false emphasis which this punctuation throws on ἡμῶν seems to me more open to objection than the use of ἀλλήλων in the sense of ἡμῶν αὐτῶν presupposed by earlier editors). On the other hand, there seems to me a great deal to be said for the stopping at 178*a* 3 ἃ ἐκεῖνος ἔλεγε πάντα, ἃ δὲ μάλιστα, as against the traditional colon after πάντα, and perhaps for τὸ εἶδος, στρογγύλον as against τὸ εἶδος στρογγύλον, at 189*e* 6, though personally I should like to have a comma after στρογγύλον as well as before it, an arrangement which I think best brings out the right distribution of emphasis (as to which I wholly agree with M. Robin), and possibly for περὶ τοῦ λόγου, instead of περὶ τοῦ λόγου (M. Robin's conjecture based on the reading of Cod. Vindobon.) at 212*c* 6. At 182*b* 1 a real difficulty is removed if we venture with M. Robin to insert after ἐν Ἡλιδι μὲν γὰρ the words καὶ ἐν Λακεδαίμονι, given by the MSS. in the previous line. Again, I find myself



much attracted by the repunctuation at 216d 4-5, ὡς τὸ σχῆμα αὐτοῦ; τοῦτο οὐ σιληνώδες; But I own I think it a real oversight to have accepted ἰδόντων for ἰώνων at 220a 8 (in the account of the 'rapt' of Socrates before Potidaea). M. Robin urges (1) that there were no Ionians among the Athenian forces on this occasion, and (2) that there is no point in mentioning the 'nationality' of the spectators of Socrates' conduct. But, as E. Meyer has observed, we have the express statement of Thucydides for the presence of numerous 'allies' in the forces brought by Callias to Potidaea; and, I would add, the mention of the Ionians is a characteristically fine touch. Men from Ionia, the native home of secularism in Greek thought, would be just the persons to find Socrates' trance odd.

Perhaps I may be allowed to correct one slightly inaccurate piece of information. The very simple explanation of the grammar of 175b 6 πάντως παρατίθετε κτλ. was not altogether new when put forward by H. Richards in 1913. It had been already given by the present writer in a review of Bury's edition of the dialogue in *Mind* for April, 1910, and I believe by Professor J. I. Beare in some other publication of the same year. (No doubt Richards's observation was quite independent.)

In the *Introduction* I would specially commend to students of Plato the thoroughness with which M. Robin has set himself to bring a wide knowledge of the remains of early Greek rhetoric to bear on the illustration of the dialogue, and the subtlety of his study of the 'psychology' of the various speakers. Now and then, no doubt, a point seems to me to be missed, and now and then, perhaps, to be read a little arbitrarily into the text. Thus I note that M. Robin oddly omits to observe the interesting coincidence that Phaedrus and Eryximachus, as well as Alcibiades, seem to have been implicated in the scandal about the 'profanation of the mysteries'; and again that he makes no reference to the language ascribed by Aeschines of Sphettus to Socrates about his ἔπος for Alcibiades. I think both points relevant to a discussion of the 'historicity' of the dialogue. And

as M. Robin has done me the honour to refer to my own name in his, on the whole unfavourable, treatment of believers in 'historicity,' perhaps I may be allowed to say that I think he slightly misunderstands our position. For my own part, of course, I have never doubted that the whole series of speeches in the *Symposium* is a free composition of Plato. But I hold that, as we can see for ourselves in the case of the speech of Aristophanes, admirably analysed by M. Robin himself, Plato has presumably taken the themes for the composition 'from life'; he is not representing Socrates as a 'pilgrim' on a voyage—its stages have never been better described than by M. Robin himself—of which the 'real' Socrates knew nothing. He means to draw a portrait which will set the great man before us 'in his habit as he lived,' and I, for one, believe that he has been successful. If this is granted I have nothing more to ask in point of principle. But I own I think it likely that the incident Plato has chosen as his starting-point, the presence of Socrates, Alcibiades, and a number of other distinguished persons at Agathon's banquet, is an historical fact. I cannot help thinking that the curiously artificial type of introduction shared by the *Symposium* with the *Parmenides* is deliberately meant to call attention to the point that both the talk at Agathon's banquet and the conversation with Parmenides and Zeno in the house of Pythodorus really did take place, and were felt to be 'interesting events.' Similarly, I still think that Plato's details about Diotima are meant to mark her as an actual person, and that Plato at least believed that, in early life, Socrates *had* consorted with persons of that kind and been influenced by the contact, though I have no more doubt than M. Robin that Plato has freely composed the actual 'discourse of Diotima' with a mind to making it a criticism of the 'discourse of Agathon.'

Occasionally I feel a little uncertain whether M. Robin does not read into the 'psychology' of the dialogue what is not there. Thus he is convinced that Plato must have held Aristophanes responsible for the condemnation of

Socrates, and consequently have thought badly of him, and this gives occasion for what seems to me misplaced subtlety in extracting a severe judgment on the poet from the words of the *Symposium*. If we are told that Aristophanes is a man whose whole business is 'with Aphrodite and Dionysus,' we might take the mention of the latter deity to allude only to the connexion of comedy with his festivals: but why Aphrodite? According to M. Robin, to convey the malicious suggestion that the poet is *mauvais homme*, 'grand buveur et grand ribaud.' Surely it is simpler, in view of the standing connexion of Aphrodite with the Graces, to see simply an appreciative reference to the 'lyric charm' commended in a well-known epigram on the poet ascribed to Plato himself. The *Apology*, by its careful discrimination between the comic poets, who started the misrepresentation of Socrates, and other persons who repeated it 'out of ill-will,' seems to me to prove that Plato never supposed the *Clouds* to be more than burlesque with no bad intention, and that he had the fairness to recognise that Aristophanes cannot be held responsible if his jests had an

unexpected tragic consequence a quarter of a century after they were uttered. M. Robin himself closes an excellent analysis of the speech composed for Plato by Aristophanes by saying truly that, in making him the deliverer of such a speech, Plato shows that he can do full justice to his merits. I think second thoughts might lead to the conclusion that there is no more malice in Plato's portrait of the poet than there is in the speech he puts into his mouth. I am not sure, again, whether the pedantry of the physician Eryximachus deserves to be insisted on with quite M. Robin's severity. Presumably the medical man's pedantry is conscious, and is being assumed for comic effect. And even Agathon, perhaps, is entitled to plead that the farce of the *Thesmophoriazusae* should not count for quite as much as M. Robin is inclined to assume as evidence to his character. These, however, are all minor points; one may differ from M. Robin on some or all of them without being the less grateful to him for an admirable text and translation, and an *Introduction* of quite exceptional depth and historical learning.

A. E. TAYLOR.

#### EXCAVATIONS AT OLYNTHUS.

*Excavations at Olynthus. Part I.: The Neolithic Settlement.* By GEORGE E. MYLONAS, PH.D. Pp. xviii+108; two coloured figures, 94 figures in text. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press; London: Milford, 1929. 34s. net.

PROFESSOR DAVID ROBINSON is much to be congratulated on the success of his excavations at this famous site, which has at last been satisfactorily identified. While remains of the classical period, especially houses, were frequent, and proved to be of exceptional interest, another point of great importance came to light. The long, broad, natural mound on which the city stood has at its southern end a small projection which may perhaps have served in classical times as an acropolis. It is easy of defence and lies close to the Resitnikia River, which flows along its western side,

and is connected with the main site by a narrow neck only. This, as might have been suspected, proved to be the first part of the area to have been inhabited, because below scanty Byzantine and classical remains a rich Neolithic settlement came to light. This is particularly welcome because, though the Bronze Age in Macedonia is now fairly well known, thanks to the researches of M. Rey and Mr. Heurtley, few remains of the Neolithic Age have been found except at Dikili Tash, near Philippi, and casual finds like those at Aivatlî during the war. The Neolithic area at Olynthus is unfortunately not very large, and the stratification has been somewhat disturbed by later building. It is therefore a great satisfaction that the excavators should have issued so promptly a full report of the Neolithic finds and so made this valuable material available to all. This account

has been entrusted to Mr. Mylonas, who assisted in the excavation and has already published a useful book on the Neolithic Age in Greece, and he presents his results in an excellent and straightforward manner. The plates, especially those of the pottery in colour, are good; but there is one drawback to all the illustrations, plans, photographs, and drawings—on none of them is given the scale of the reproduction or any indication of the size of the originals. In addition to this omission Fig. 8 has no mark of orientation and Fig. 9 has its orientation inverted, with south above and north below.

As usual in a prehistoric site the pottery takes first place. The architectural remains are insufficient for any certain conclusions, though the discovery of a potter's kiln is extremely interesting. In the references to other prehistoric kilns, that at Tiryns could be included. The stratification shows that there were three successive Neolithic settlements. The first is characterised by monochrome black polished ware. The second and third both contained monochrome ware, incised ware, and painted pottery, the difference between these two being that in the third and latest stratum there was rather more of the incised and painted pottery than in the second. The black polished ware is generally of good technique, and so also is the incised ware, some pieces of which are excellent. The painted ware is not very plentiful, and falls into two main classes—one painted in a ribbon technique with designs in black-brown on red, and the other with patterns in graphite on a shiny

black surface. As the author rightly remarks, the general character of the pottery shows that the inhabitants were allied culturally to the people of the second Neolithic period in Thessaly, especially in South-Eastern Thessaly, and to the bearers of the culture revealed by the finds at Dikili Tash in Eastern Macedonia. There seems to have been no connexion at all between these Neolithic Macedonians and the Danubian tribes.

These conclusions are borne out also by the figurines, of which ten in stone and clay were found, and by the numerous celts, which are admirably handled by the author. The smaller miscellaneous objects, though adequately described, could have been more fully treated with references to parallels for sling bullets, shell bracelets, and bone pins and awls. Their evidence, at any rate, confirms the author's conclusions. The large masses of baked clay, called spit supports or loom weights, seem more likely to be the latter in spite of their weight—four pounds. They could well have been used on primitive vertical looms like some till recently employed for peasant weaving in Norway.

The author is inclined to believe that the Bronze Age settlement was not at Olynthus, but at the mound of Hagios Mamas excavated by Mr. Heurtley. In view, however, of the scanty classical remains below the Byzantine stratum it may well be that this part of the site had been levelled successively by Hellenic and Byzantine builders so that the stratification 'telescoped.'

A. WACE.

#### ICTUS AND ACCENT.

*Iktus und Akzent im lateinischen Sprechvers.* Von EDUARD FRAENKEL. Mit einem Beitrag von ANDREAS THIERFELDER. 10" x 6½". Pp. viii + 425. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1928. Paper, M. 25.

In this book Dr. Fraenkel has greatly enlarged our knowledge of the pronunciation of Latin. Two schools, which may be termed the German and the French, hold sharply divided opinions

as to the character of the accent of Classical Latin. The former maintain that it was in essence expiratory, a strong stress comparable with that of English or German; the latter, that it was a musical or tonic accent, consisting solely of a raising or lowering of the pitch of the voice, and therefore playing no part in such sound-developments as the shortening or loss of syllables, or in a metrical scansion which depended

only on the alternation of short and long syllables.

There are four main avenues of approach to the solution of this problem:

1. The descriptions given by Latin authors and grammarians.

2. The phonetic development within Classical Latin itself.

3. The phonetic development of the Romance languages.

4. The relations, if any, between accent and metre.

The descriptions of the grammarians, and the very name they give the phenomenon, *accentus*, refer to a tone rather than a stress (see, in the last instance, Meillet in the book reviewed in *C.R.*, 1930, p. 23).

Any language possessing a strong stress appears to be liable to great alterations in its unstressed syllables, which may be shortened or entirely disappear. Yet for a period of over 500 years the unaccented syllables of Latin maintained themselves practically unchanged.

On the other hand, the Romance languages show just those changes which are usually associated with a stress accent; and there is in nearly all cases a sharp distinction between the fate of an accented syllable and that of an unaccented. This—it is reasonably maintained by the French school—is because the tone of Classical Latin had by the fourth or fifth century A.D. become a stress, a development observed in the history of many languages.

As far as this, the balance of argument is in favour of a tone. There remains the fourth consideration. The word-accent of ancient Greek and of Vedic Sanskrit was undoubtedly a tone: the metres of these languages were entirely independent of the word-accent, and were conditioned solely by the number of morae, or syllables, and by the alternation of longs and shorts. The French school, relying especially upon the apparent conflict of accent and ictus in hexameter and pentameter verses, maintains that in Latin, too, metre was equally independent of word-accent. Their opponents, however, say that there is, on the contrary, especially in the earlier

drama, a distinct effort to make ictus and word-accent coincide; and that, since verse in which ictus and word-accent are at variance would be too far removed from ordinary speech, the accent of Latin was a stress.

This is the question which Fraenkel has set himself to examine once more. He has brought to the examination not only wide reading and an acute intellect, but also a most thorough study of the works of Plautus and Terence. His main thesis is this: In the verses intended, not for recitation or singing, but for speaking, there is a correspondence of ictus and accent which is beyond the realm of chance. It behoves us, then, to see whether in those instances where ictus and accent are apparently at variance there may not be special circumstances leading to a shift of the usual word-accent which would here also bring word-accent and ictus into agreement. Here the genius of the author asserts itself.

According to him, there are certain definite positions in verse or sentence, certain definite words or classes of words, certain definite syntactical combinations, in which it is reasonable to suppose a modification of the usual word-accent. It is in these, and in these alone, that Plautus and Terence permit themselves an apparent clash of accent and ictus. Fraenkel's theory is that there was actually a change of word-accent in these specified conditions and that, therefore, here too ictus and accent in reality coincided.

It is impossible to follow the argument in detail here. But an example or two may indicate the general line. If certain word-groups, syntactically closely connected, are considered as accentual unities, their accent will be found to coincide with the ictus. One of such groups consists of pronominal adjective and substantive: e.g. *illi senī* (separately accented *illi* : *senī*) appears as *illī senī* in *Poen.* 64; adverbs in close association, such as *minimē malas, miserē miser, magis facite* (i.e. *magis facēte*); numerals with their nouns, such as *decēm minas* (cf. *decēmviri*); verbal phrases, such as *veniām dare, donō datumst*.

Even if the syntactical group is



separated by other words—here is one of the author's most acute and far-reaching observations—the accentuation of the group, as displayed by the ictus, remains the same. Not only, then, *illū senti*, but *illū tibi moriens nos commendavit senex* (*Ad.* 457).

If this is so—and Fraenkel's demonstration is very convincing—the connection of words in the sentence was indicated not only by inflection and order, but also by change of word-accent; and in the interpretation of a passage the position of the ictus, which may disclose to us this change of accent, cannot be neglected.

It is perhaps to be regretted that the author had not opportunity to consider his theory of group-accentuation from the point of view of later developments in the Romance languages. It is to be hoped that he or another may yet undertake this. For certainly, at first sight, his brilliant theory seems to explain certain phenomena in Romance development. For example, Professor Meyer-Lübke ('*Historische französische Grammatik*' I. p. 202) says that the article (Lat. *ille*, from which is derived French *le*) was unaccented. But he admits that the disappearance of the first of two unaccented syllables is contrary to the general development of French; and he suggests another not altogether satisfactory explanation. But the accentuation, attested according to Fraenkel by the position of the ictus in Plautus and Terence, of groups like *illū pater* (*illūm patrem*), *illū caballus* would account for the preservation of the second syllable of the article at the expense of the first in Fr. *le père*, *le cheval*.

Certain adjectives appear in a number of languages to be peculiarly liable to special accentual development. Thus the word for 'good' (Skt. *bhadrā*) appears in most Indo-Aryan languages in an aberrant form (Panjabi *bhalā* instead of \**bhallā*, Nepali *bhalo* instead of \**bhālo*, and so on). So too in French, *bon* represents an unaccented form beside Old French *buen* > *bōnum*. Precisely this adjective is found by Fraenkel to form a syntactical group with accent-shift; thus *bonā fide*, *formā bona*. So too *malus*; but of this the accented and

unaccented forms would show no difference in Romance.

So far it is difficult not to agree with the author's conclusion that the ictus was never placed on syllables which could not under any circumstances bear the accent in ordinary speech. The other contention, that because the ictus is made to agree with the accented syllable the accent must have been a strong stress, appears to me more doubtful. Is it not possible to combine the views of the two schools as to the nature of the accent in such a way that there is no necessary clash between the four classes of evidence referred to above? It is becoming increasingly evident to the phonetician that syllabic accent or prominence consists of three main elements—length, stress, tone. One of these elements may be dominant, but one or both of the others may be present at the same time in greater or less degree. There seems to be nothing intrinsically improbable in the hypothesis that the Classical Latin accent was largely of a musical nature, as indicated by the grammarians and the phonetic history of the language, but that there was present also some element of stress, sufficiently strong for it to be necessary in versification founded on popular speech to make ictus and accent coincide. That even a weak stress may play a part in metre is shown by the popular verse of the Gurkhas, in which the word-stress, though extremely weak when compared, for example, with that of English, is nevertheless made to correspond with the ictus.

Finally, although Fraenkel considers that Augustan verse—notably the hexameter and pentameter, with its more artificial character, due to a more purely literary and Greek tradition—no longer preserved the relation between ictus and word-accent, it would be interesting to investigate whether here, too, traces of agreement might not be found outside the fairly regular agreement in the fifth and sixth feet and the frequent agreement in the first and fourth feet. A casual reading of passages from the *Aeneid* shows that at least many of the apparent disagreements between word-accent and ictus occur in syntactical and

other groups in which, used by Plautus or Terence, Fraenkel would postulate shift of accent.

In an excursus of forty pages Dr. Thierfelder discusses on the same lines

and in an equally thorough manner the variations of ictus (and therefore presumably of accent) in words of the type *facilius*.

R. L. TURNER.

### THE BUDÉ DE FINIBUS.

*Cicéron, Des Termes extrêmes des Biens et des Maux.* Texte établi et traduit par J. Martha. Tome I. (Livres i., ii.). Pp. xxxi + 254. Paris: Société d'Édition 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1928. Paper, 20 fr.

The introduction to this admirable volume is both readable and full of information, with copious references to Latin sources. It suggests that Cicero's lack of original thought in philosophy has been overstated. He himself modestly admits it (*Att.* 12. 52. 3 'ἀπόγραφα sunt . . . uerba tantum affero'), but elsewhere writes 'ut solemus, e fontibus eorum iudicio arbitrioque nostro . . . haurimus,' *Off.* 1. 6, and 'non interpretum fungimur munere sed . . . nostrum iudicium et nostrum scribendi ordinem adiungimus,' *Fin.* 1. 6. His quotations from poetry and illustrative anecdotes show that he had made philosophy a part of his own mind. Still, his task is only 'vulgarisation philosophique,' and his originality cannot be tested as all his Greek authorities are lost. His criticisms of Epicurus and the Stoics are admittedly from Antiochus, but he adds something of his own, notably in II. 54-68. And the brief criticism of the Academic-Peripatetic doctrine in V. seems original. 'It is to be noticed that here the Stoics are praised for being always in rigorous accord with their principles, though in IV. they were reproached for inconsequence. The probable explanation is that, if in IV. Cicero availed himself of Antiochus to criticize the Stoics, in V. he resumes his independence to criticize Antiochus.' He had studied philosophy from 18 to 28, 'the age when the intellect is formed,' and from debating its questions pro and con as a rhetorical exercise he had passed to a lively interest in the subject itself. 'He penetrated all the sects then living and made the round of all

the systems of repute; he sought the guidance of the most famous masters.'

*De finibus bonorum et malorum* M. Martha renders 'Des termes extrêmes des biens et des maux,' rejecting 'Des bornes des biens et des maux' and 'Des suprêmes biens et des suprêmes maux.' The last implies the phrase τέλη ἀγαθῶν καὶ τέλη κακῶν, 'different views as to the supreme good and the supreme evil.' This, I may remark, is rejected by Herr Philippson (*Phil. Wochenschrift*, 1913, p. 613, and 1923, p. 11), who holds that the plural means merely 'The End of Goods and the End of Evils'; but it is accepted by Reid (*Academica* 2. 114), and is supported by *Ac.* 2. 132 'omnibus eis finibus bonorum quos exposui malorum finis esse contrarios.' It is consoling to an English translator to find also a Frenchman atalossover 'honestum' and 'honestas' meaning τὸ καλόν. M. Martha rejects 'honnête' and 'honnêteté' as having lost the doctrinal value of the Latin, and falls back on 'beauté morale,' 'moralité,' and 'pure moralité.'

As a critical edition the book is on ambitious lines. The text is based on A as far as it goes and then on P and R (*Rotterdamensis*, collated and brought to the front by Schiche in his Teubner text, 1915). A useful sketch is given of all the eight MSS. of value, and full critical notes; the aim is 'to place before the reader the essential data of the text, to enable him to check for himself the value of the readings adopted.' New conjectures are few; one may select the following: I. 5 non illi (MSS. 'nulli,' 'illi') satis eruditi; 19 attulit rem commenticiam, itaque (MSS. 'itaque' before 'attulit'); 50 addit aliquid (MSS. 'aliquid,' 'aliquid'); 51 inflammatus potius (MSS. 'potius infl.', 'potius atque infl.');

61 'monotropi' (μονότροποι) suggested in the note for 'monstrosi,' Lambinus 'morosi'; II. 32

nil dolendi, nil dolere, 69 nil habemus (MSS. 'nihil,' 'clausula vitiosa'); 94 sic [Epicurus] (with comma after 'cient,' so that 'sic' goes with 'praecentet').

M. Martha remarks that a translator of a philosophical work of Cicero is making 'a translation of a translation,' and to present the original thought as closely as possible must observe a rigorous precision, even at the cost of elegance. But if a foreigner may judge, he needs no such apology; his translation runs with French clearness and simplicity, giving nothing not in the Latin except a few connecting words scrupulously bracketed, but taking plenty of room to turn round in, as the French manner is; the French is at least half as long again as the Latin, which is in larger type and more spaced. The purpose of interpretation could hardly be better served.

Here is a short extract from what in the Latin is a show passage (I. 40): 'Que le plaisir soit le bien suprême, ce qui suit permet de s'en rendre compte très aisément. Imaginons un homme jouissant de grands, de multiples, de continuels plaisirs, tant de l'âme que du corps, *sans la gêne présente ni la menace future d'aucune douleur*, est-il possible de citer un état supérieur à celui-là, ou plus désirable? Une pareille disposition, en effet, suppose nécessairement chez cet homme une âme ferme, ne redoutant ni la mort ni la douleur, la mort, parce que la sensibilité en est absente, *la douleur, parce que, si elle dure, elle est légère, et que, si elle est forte, elle dure peu*, qu'ainsi la violence est com-

pensée par la courte durée et la prolongation par l'allègement.'

I have italicized two clauses here. On the first M. Martha notes 'Impossible de rendre l'allitération cherchée.' It is *nullo dolore nec impediēte nec impendente* ('unhampered by the presence or the prospect of pain'). The second is *dolor in longinquitate levis, in gravitate brevis soleat esse* ('pain is usually light if long, short if strong'). One has an odd feeling that the English language, though so alien, is nearer than French to Latin in emphasis. It is true that at Cicero's sarcastic echo of the tag, II. 22 *si gravis, brevis, si longus, levis*, M. Martha falls into line: 'cruelle? courte; longue? légère.'

One or two more trifles: I. 19 cum illud occurreret, 'comme nôtre homme . . . s'avise que': perhaps rather 'met with the difficulty that.' § 22 philosophiae parte quae est *quaerendi ac disserendi*, quae λογική dicitur, 'la recherche et l'exposition <du vrai>': but surely this French describes *all* philosophy? § 27 Madvig's 'iracundiae' for 'iracundiae' is ignored; § 41 'quo (for MSS. quod) melius sit' is a conjecture of Müller. § 69 '[si] ludicra' with Boeckel, 'par l'habitude qu'on a de se divertir aux exercices ou à la chasse,' making 'exercendi' depend on 'consuetudine' and govern 'ludicra'; but this covers only 'gymnasia campum canes equos,' and ignores 'loca fana urbes,' so it seems better to keep the text and render 'ludicra exercendi aut uenandi' 'gladiatorial shows and fights with wild beasts.'

H. RACKHAM.

Christ's College, Cambridge.

### THE BUDÉ PROPERTIUS.

*Properce*. Texte établi et traduit par D. PAGANELLI. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1929. Paper, 25 francs.

THIS Budé volume has no value for students. The text, of the tame-cat school (C.R. XVI.), is based on Phillimore's Oxford edition and preserves some features of its spelling, thus *arena* and the accusatives in *-is*. At IV. 3. 11 the *-is* in *haec sunt pactae mihi noctis* is perhaps a slip, but *minantis*, IV. 6. 49, is taken as nomina-

tive. (So also *mortalis*, III. 18. 5, and *fatalis*, 25. 17.) No lacuna is marked and only one transposition, in I. 15, where a line is wrongly numbered; division is made only in II. 7 and 28. No fresh suggestion for the text is attempted or recorded. P. differs from Phillimore at thirty-nine places, not counting details of punctuation, for the most part adopting easier readings from the inferior manuscripts. Mentioning in his appendix Housman once

and Postgate twice (once as Posgate) and Richmond not at all, he adopts fifteen of Phillimore's emendations (two being unacknowledged) and deems three other suggestions worthy of record, of which two are wildly improbable. The punctuation of I. 22 (lines 4 and 5 only being bracketed) is impossible, *cf.* also II. 25. 46, IV. 1. 122. In IV. 3. 51 *tibi* is of course retained and in 48 *Africus*, on which there is this helpful note: 'L'Africus est un vent du Sud-Ouest; ce n'est pas un vent glacial.' The appendix, carelessly printed, records AFN more fully, but not more correctly, than Phillimore; very few emendations are admitted. In the text we find *Charydhis*, *potuitsi*, QUID and at IV. 7. 10 *ira*.

P. attributes the Loeb translation to Elton and does not mention Phillimore's. His own version is a free paraphrase, fluent and limpid. The first two lines are typical: 'Ce fut Cynthie qui la première, de ses jolis

yeux, fit ma conquête et mon malheur; mon cœur était encore vierge.' IV. 4. 66 is enlivened into 'oh! viens à mes yeux, ombre chérie, viens.' He has no scruples about omissions (II. 28. 33 *hoc*, 29. 27 *hinc*, etc.) and slides comfortably over difficulties. Some interesting interpretations may be found at I. 10. 24, II. 21, 15. 5 ('une coiffure qui n'est que d'hier'), 16. 22; II. 19. 31 ('il me faut te donner d'autres noms que le tien'), 34. 81-4 *haec* and *his* of Propertius' verses; III. 11. 7 *ista* of ll. 5-6, and 26 'et la capitale de la B. ne put rester debout qu'annexée à son empire et soumise à ses lois'; IV. 4. 84, Tarpeia kills the dogs, but 88, Tatius is to name the day; 7. 6 *regna* 'trop grande.' Some of these may be defensible, but there is a large crop of mistakes; thus III. 19. 21 *uenumdata* taken as singular, 25. 10 *fracta* as future; IV. 1. 33 'Oui, le faubourg de B. était alors moins qu'une petite ville,' 4. 40 *uersa* 'livrée en proie.' H. STEWART.

#### LIVY, XXVII.

*Tito Livio: Ab Urbe Condita. Liber XXVII.*: Con introduzione e commento di E. CESAREO. (Biblioteca Scolastica di Scrittori Latini e Greci.) Pp. lvi + 214. Turin, etc.: G. B. Paravia and Co., 1929. L. 15.

OF the single books of Livy which have appeared in this series, this edition is, in one point at least, the most useful. The commentary, as was to be expected, owes much to Weissenborn and Müller and not a little to Friedersdorff; but while the present editor has not much to add of general explanatory notes (on historical matters he usually accepts the authority of De Sanctis), he makes a number of interesting comments on Livy's use of archaisms (some new parallels with Sallust are mentioned), on his poetical colour, and on the 'epic' touches to be detected in this book. Familiar as we are with generalisations on Livy's style and with closer studies of Livian language, it is yet refreshing to find an editor of a single book of Livy who treats the history as a work of art, and who gives space in his commentary to an appreci-

ation of the author's descriptive powers and choice of words. He also allows himself to call the reader's attention to such topics as Livy's attitude to prodigies, his austerity, and his characterisation. Most of his remarks on all these points are sensible and interesting. Occasionally he puts too much emphasis on a small point (as in his long note on the poetical colour of 30. 3).

The introduction is intended to be read in close connexion with the commentary, but it would have been more useful if instead of general remarks on Livy's Paduan puritanism, on his attitude to religion and to Roman institutions—remarks illustrated mainly from the first decade—the editor had brought together in a general view more of the matter discussed in the commentary. In the few pages that deal with Book XXVII., the best are those in which he refers to Livy's portrayal of the Roman populace. Book XXVII. affords a magnificent example in the description of Rome's feelings before and after the battle of the Metaurus.

The text is based on that of Luchs



(ed. 1879). It is a pity that Unger's excellent correction in 15. 5 (*Laevinus* for *Linus*) is entirely ignored, though it was adopted by Luchs himself in 1889 and by subsequent editors. In 1. 9, the editor accepts '*in Cn. Fulvii similitudinem nominis . . . increpans*,' repeating Weissenborn's quotation (which is not strictly parallel), and wrongly calling this the Spirensian reading. The evidence of MSS. and passages like Cic. *ad Q. Fr.* 2. 3. 3 both point to the accusative without in as correct. In 15. 15, we have *illo loco . . . praepositus* (rightly, I think) against Luchs. In 39. 13, *celeriores* of the MSS. is rightly kept (the defence is hardly needed since Luchs accepted it later); and in 18. 6, *facilior in ascensum* is also rightly kept, though here, where some defence is needed, there is only a reference to Weissenborn which does not help. In 14. 14, *supra mille et trecenti occisi* is silently adopted.<sup>1</sup>

Yet the edition is not without some value for the text of Livy. Not having room for a critical appendix, the editor has included in the commentary some notes written by Professor Castiglioni. Some of these are useful and illuminating—e.g., in 20. 12, C. accounts for the reading *decernerent* given by the codex Puteanus for *obicerent* (Sp), by reading *decerneretur* for *ageretur* in the next line.

<sup>1</sup> In this passage, only one unimportant MS. (β) supports *trecenti*. On the other hand, in 42. 7 the editor (with Luchs) reads *supra septingentos*, where P has *supra septingenti*. There only, it seems, is the full adverbial use of *supra* with numerals well attested in Livy. In 30. 6. 9, where Luchs reads *supra duo milia septingenti*, P has only a numeral sign, and the nominative is supported only by βHF. It remains doubtful whether *supra* was used (like *ad*) with numerals without affecting their case. Cf., e.g., Neue-Wagener, *Formenlehre der lat. Sprache*, II, p. 926.

(But in 48. 14, where P gives *sistrum* and not even Livy could have failed to write *dextrum*, C.'s attempt to account for the error by reading *ipsum* is surely wild. It is far more likely that a line had fallen out from the archetype of P and Sp). In 15. 7, C. points out rightly that <ut> should be inserted before *urbem* and not before *ab*. In 25. 14, his defence of *in aciem exire* on palaeographical grounds is good; and in 30. 9, he gives a good parallel for this use of *refero*. Some of C.'s notes are not so convincing: e.g., in 17. 7, he supports the emendation of Perthes *numero* <in officinis> *incluso* (*numero incluso* Sp: om. P). Here (a) there is no need to emend, (b) emendation supposes a second omission in Sp, (c) the supposed omission by P is too long for a line. Nor does C.'s alternative *numero ad id usus* help. In 19. 12, he wishes to insert *se* before *uero*, where *cupere uero diceret* is surely excellent Livian Latin. His defence of the order *maior iam enim* in the parenthesis in 27. 11 is not supported by any example of *enim* in this position, and his suggestion for emending 27. 13 proposes an order of words which can hardly be Latin. His doubts of *rebatur* in 25. 11 are unnecessary, and in 49. 9, where he proposes *omnes* <capit> *delerique*, the sense is weakened. P's special love of adding *-que* can, of course, be illustrated from many passages (cf., e.g., 21. 60. 4 note (a) in Oxford Text).

The following misprints have been noted: In the text—1. 12 read *cecidit* for *cedidit*, 28. 11 *cataracta* for *caratacta*. In 14. 7, the commentary supposes the old spelling *dissupati*, but *dissipati* occurs in the text.

S. K. JOHNSON.

University College, Swansea.

## ROMAN POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS.

*Roman Political Institutions from City to State.* (The History of Civilization.) By LÉON HOMO. Pp. xviii + 403. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner and Co., 1929. 16s.

In a series of which the volumes considerably vary in merit, this is certainly to be ranked among the better. It will

be a useful book too to put into the hands of sufficiently advanced pupils. It aims at surveying the whole story of the constitutional development of the Roman state—a large matter for a canvas of this size. But the composition is well planned and proportion has on the whole been observed, though it is

possible to hold that too little space has been given to the Principate, and too much relatively to the 'Dominate.' The fault, however, if fault it be, has certain compensations in this country, where undergraduate study is too liable to come to an abrupt end with Marcus Aurelius.

The difficulties of arrangement and presentation, of course, are obvious. In general Professor Homo is more interesting and more successful in analysis than in narrative exposition. Any author's treatment of origins and of the Early Republic is bound to arouse disagreements about premises. In that complicated maze of doubtful hypotheses, a surveyor on this scale must inevitably take his line and just do his best with it. In the matter of origins, some may believe that Professor Homo attributes too little to the native Latin and too much to the Etruscan conqueror; the implication of p. 10 seems to be that *curiae* as well as tribes were Etruscan, which must surely be wrong. Again we may not agree that plebeians were unable to vote in the Comitia Curiata until the end of the fourth century, or prefer the view that the Comitia Tributa developed alongside the Concilium Plebis to that which regards the latter as having turned into the former.

The middle part of the book is the best. Interesting use is made of the census figures of the third and fourth centuries to show the antecedents of the social and political problem which faced the Gracchi. The sketch of conditions under the late Republic is also well done, and in particular the precedents for the Principate established by Pompey's career are well brought out, though it is possible to hold that

the author exaggerates the degree to which Pompey was a consistent statesman working throughout deliberately towards a considered goal.

The handling of the Early Empire is not so satisfactory. The work of Augustus does not appear in its full greatness. The account of the unequal rivalry between Senate and Princeps, though the statements are true, gives yet a false because an incomplete picture. There is no sufficient appreciation on the one hand of the Empire's debt to members of the Senatorial order, as opposed to the Senate, nor on the other hand of the change in the personnel of the Senate which took place during the first and second centuries.

The translation, though not impeccable, is on the whole well done. Do we in English call magistrates 'organs of execution'? 'Opportunist' is to be preferred to 'opportunistic'; 'no longer' on p. 106 should presumably be read as 'not'; 'antimony,' 'usuary' and 'two' for 'too' have escaped the proof-reader. Without the French text I am unable to assess the blame for the mistranslation of Livy on p. 95.

A more serious defect is the bibliography. Quite clearly the French edition relied upon citations from French, German, and Italian scholars exclusively. For the English edition some English books have been added, but upon what principle they have been chosen is obscure. The list contains Henderson's *Nero*; but the reader will look in vain for such names, for instance, as Greenidge, Hardy, Heitland, Pelham, Rice Holmes, Rostovtzev, Stuart Jones, or for reference to the *Cambridge Ancient History*, or to any English periodical.

W. R. HALLIDAY.

#### THE ROMAN EMPIRE.

*L'Empire Romain.* By E. ALBERTINI.  
Pp. 462; 1 map. Paris: Alcan, 1929.  
50 frs.

THIS history is a work of wide scope. It carries the story of the Roman Empire as far as 395 A.D.; it surveys not merely Roman statecraft but the whole of Roman civilisation; and it

transgresses the Roman frontiers in order to describe the contemporary civilisations of India and China. Yet it barely exceeds 450 pages, and within that compass provides a panorama in which hardly any essential feature is lacking. To achieve this end Professor Albertini has had to sacrifice the fine

writing and the lively polemics with which the history of the Caesars is usually associated. His book makes sober reading; but by its dry light the Roman world shows up in more accurate perspective.

Needless to say, Professor Albertini inflicts no more court scandal or psychoanalysis of emperors upon his readers than is strictly necessary. He has not been tempted by the recent spate of good monographs on the Roman army to give military history undue emphasis. On administrative history he writes at greater length and with especial care. He hardly lays enough stress on the improvement in provincial government which was the brightest spot in the shady record of the early Caesars. On the other hand, he traces with more than usual clearness the steps by which the Principate was metamorphosed into a Sultanate.

On the subject of Roman economics the author has held himself somewhat severely in check. In describing the expansion of trade under the early Caesars he might with advantage have furnished some more of those telling details which recent writers like Professor Rostovtseff and Mr. Charlesworth have made familiar to English readers. His account of the financial confusion in the third century A.D. could also have been expanded with profit: on such an excessively difficult subject even advanced readers require ample explanation. On the other hand due emphasis is laid on the narrow basis of the Empire's economic prosperity, which rested on the exploitation of the remaining population by the bourgeoisie. In some brief but telling paragraphs Professor Albertini shows up the salient features of art and literature in the first two centuries A.D.: he attributes the characteristic fidgetiness of this period to its lack of faith in human reason, and he points out the effect of rhetorical studies in spreading Roman culture over the western provinces quickly but thinly. His treatment of Roman architecture is somewhat uneven. He describes

adequately the general appearance of Roman towns, but hardly notices the Roman villas, and does not mention some of the Empire's finest show-pieces, such as the Pantheon, the Pont du Gard and the bridge of Alcantara. In his description of the religious conflicts in the Roman Empire Professor Albertini has little to say about Neoplatonism, but he traces the growth of Christianity in clear and satisfactory outline.

The general accuracy of the book leaves little scope for criticism of detail. A few amendments may here be suggested:

*Roman Commerce.*—The absence of references to Hippalus in Juba and Strabo makes it unlikely that this pioneer of the Indian trade dates back to the first century B.C. (p. 127, n. 1). The Graeco-Roman trade in silk probably went, not by the Ferghana route across the Tien-Shan mountains, but by the more southerly track through the Pamirs into the Tarim basin (p. 228). The suggestion that the Romans were attracted to Germany (which, incidentally, is not a rainy country) by its potential resources in grain and cattle is somewhat startling (p. 54). Tacitus' unenthusiastic remarks in the *Germania* (ch. 5) hardly bear this out.

*Roman Britain.*—The wall of Antoninus was separated from Hadrian's Wall, not by 100 kilometres, but by 100 miles. The evacuation of Scotland, which the author tentatively dates at 193 A.D., is proved by a mass of archaeological evidence to belong to c. 180 A.D. In a description of Agricola's campaigns the plan for an invasion of Ireland would seem to deserve at least a passing mention.

Lastly, is it not unfair to Tiberius and Germanicus to assume a 'latent hostility' between them (p. 58)? Professor Albertini admits that Tiberius' attitude to his nephew offers no evidence of strained relations (p. 65).

Sed haec hactenus. This book will make very profitable reading for any one who seriously desires to understand the Roman Empire.

M. CARY.

## A NEW TEXT OF APULEIUS.

*Apulei Metamorphoseon Libri XI.* Editit CAESAR GIARRATANO. Pp. xlix + 333. Turin: Paravia, 1929. L. 34.

THIS valuable edition is interesting as the first attempt to apply to the text of the *Metamorphoses* the principle for which I argued in *C.Q.* 1924, pp. 27 ff. and 85 ff.—that, where the oldest MS. F is illegible, certain of the later MSS. must be consulted, in addition to the next in age,  $\phi$ . Professor Giarratano, who writes of my work with the greatest generosity, has examined all the evidence for himself, and has fully collated a large number of MSS., of which he gives useful descriptions. He has also checked my measurements of the crucial tear in fol. 160 of F. His conclusions agree almost entirely with mine. He finds no trace of independence of F, and he accepts my view that the seven MSS. which I grouped as 'Class I.' are ultimately derived from an untorn copy of F older than  $\phi$ . He has even made full collations of twelve MSS. of the worst class ('Class II.'). The results were disappointing, and he concludes (p. xxvi) that the 'archetype' of this group was derived *ab ipso codice F iam omnium correctorum operam perpeso*. I am myself inclined to suspect that in many of the corruptions which the defaced F shares with this group F is borrower rather than lender. That F has suffered even since the sixteenth century is certain from an interesting fact which Giarratano quotes from Beyte's *Quaestiones Appuleianae*. In VIII. 22, as I recorded in *C.Q.* 1924, a variant for *uxori* has been erased in F's margin. I suggested that the erasure must conceal *luxurie*, the reading of the MSS. of Class I. and of all the early editions. In 1926 I half persuaded myself that under a strong glass I could trace the word there, but neither Giarratano nor the expert palaeographer Rostagno considers that anything can be read, though both agree that something is certainly erased. Yet Beyte quotes from the marginal notes of Petrus Victorius (1499-1585), in a Munich copy of a 1488 edition, the following statement about F, which had escaped my notice: '*uxori et in margine eadem manu luxurie.*'

But this is mainly a theoretical point: my own experience confirms Giarratano's view that Class II. in fact contains little or nothing of real value. I am not quite so sure that he is right in concluding (p. xxxvi) that the MSS. of the mixed Class III. cannot possibly throw on F any light not furnished by those of Class I., for N2's *resiste* in IV. 33 (see *C.Q.* 1924, p. 91) gives me pause: but they are so deeply contaminated that an editor may not unreasonably ignore them.

On the other hand, Giarratano is definitely wrong in maintaining (p. xxiii) that of the seven MSS. of Class I. only A (Ambros. N. 180) need be considered at all. It is true that B 1 can be omitted, as a copy of A, though it occasionally serves to check A's erasures and corrections: and there is little virtue in the corrupt L 1 and V 2 or in the late and feeble N 4. But E (the Etonensis) has indisputable value. It is vitiated by emendation, but it is sometimes more useful than A. For example in I. 10 (p. 9, 15 Helm), where F and  $\phi$  have both suffered erasure, E's *diecule ea creone* should be quoted as well as A's *diecula ecreone*, for F probably had *diecula eacreone*, a false division of *dieculae a creone*. Here Giarratano, like Helm, has overlooked part of F's erasure (noted by Eyssenhardt and Van der Vliet), and quotes A's *diecula* only, without its *ecreone*. His under-valuation of E is not surprising, for it is too illegible to be photographed, and he had to rely on what I gave in *C.Q.*, supplemented by an inspection by one of his former pupils. He seems to have judged it from its inferior cousin S, which was sent him from St. Omer; in this passage S is useless.

It is true, however, that in most cases the combined evidence of  $\phi$  and A (which is all that he uses) gives all the evidence now obtainable for the original readings of F in illegible passages. His collation of A seems to be full and accurate, though he should have quoted it rather more freely: for instance in III. 11 (p. 60, 15 Helm) the true readings of F and  $\phi$  are so doubtful that it is unwise to omit that of A, which I



quoted (with those of E and S) in *C.Q.* 1924, p. 90. In F and  $\phi$  themselves he has observed several facts overlooked by Helm, and silently corrects a few mistakes of mine (for instance my false statement that in F the last word of Book III. is *rodebamus*), but this part of his work is somewhat disappointing. He has certainly missed many unrecorded partial erasures, especially of marginal variants. For instance in IV. 18 (p. 88, 14 Helm) he follows his predecessors in giving F's reading as *confarte*, though it has in fact *confarte* in the text and *cfestū* in the margin, as Rostagno agrees. Nor does he here quote  $\phi$ 's untouched reading *cōfestū cfarte*, recorded by Hildebrand and Van der Vliet, though implicitly denied by Eyssenhardt and Helm.

Giarratano's general discussion of F and  $\phi$  in his preface is valuable, though he is perhaps too confident in distinguishing F's correcting hands: I doubt if  $\phi$ 's occasional agreement with corrections not made by F's original scribe proves that any of these corrections are older than  $\phi$ , which may be their source.

These remarks have dealt exclusively with the use of the MSS.; but the elucidation of F's obscurities, however fascinating, is not in truth the chief task that faces a modern editor of Apuleius. Before Jahn and Eyssenhardt applied to the text Keil's happy guess of the unique authority of F, scholars were struggling in the dark; but the main facts have now been accessible for more than sixty years and most of the rest for more than twenty. We have long known almost all that can ever be known of what F reads: the real problem is the relation of F's text to what Apuleius wrote.

Here Giarratano's work deserves high praise. His text is a sound and scholarly construction, of a somewhat conservative cast: he never shirks difficulties, and all his conclusions are reached by careful and serious thought. The influence of Wiman's *Textkritiska Studier* (for which see *C.R.* 1929, p. 91) can be felt in many passages, especially where Giarratano admits odd grammatical constructions, but he is no blind follower of that ingenious scholar. He has taken remarkable pains to assign conjectures to their true authors, and silently

corrects many of Helm's ascriptions. His bibliography of publications since about 1860 makes it easy to trace to their source the more recent emendations, and with the help of Oudendorp and Hildebrand the student can now be sure that he knows most of his predecessors' suggestions. Giarratano gives almost all conjectures made since the middle of the nineteenth century, and though many, as he admits with a sigh, might well have been forgotten, such a collection is extremely useful. It is not, however, always accurate: Wiman, for example, conjectured *enicabar* in IX. 32, not *enicabat*. The bibliography is excellent, and wonderfully full—it even quotes the *Cambridge University Reporter*—and Giarratano really knows the works which he enumerates. By an oversight the recent books of Médan and Bernhard are omitted from the list, but they are freely used in the notes. Helm's pagination is wisely given in the margin of the text.

His own conjectures are few and modest, and he solves no outstanding puzzles: one or two of them are not new, for instance *et scitum [et] cavillum* (I. 7), adopted by Oudendorp on alleged manuscript authority, and *<noxam> annosam* in the same chapter, ascribed by the same editor to an anonymous *vir doctus*. Most of his suggestions are sensible and possible, but few, if any, carry overwhelming conviction. He records more and bolder emendations by Castiglioni, the general editor of the Paravia series: but these are seldom more than plausible, and he wisely admits few of them into his text.

One of the editor's hardest problems is orthography. Giarratano, like Helm, follows F wherever possible, and eschews forcible uniformity, but he gives in the preface valuable statistics of F's practice. In all Greek words, however, he changes *f* to *ph* if F gives the correct form even once, but not otherwise. These changes are doubtless right, and should have been carried further, though it is difficult to accustom oneself to Photis as the name of Lucius' attractive mistress.

It will be obvious to readers of this review that the merits of Giarratano's

edition altogether outweigh its defects. It is a monument of careful and strenuous research, and it will be

indispensable to all serious students of Apuleius.

D. S. ROBERTSON.

#### TERTULLIAN'S APOLOGY.

*Tertullien, Apologétique.* Texte établi et traduit par J.-P. WALTZING, avec la collaboration de A. SEVERYNS. Paris: Société d'Édition 'Les Belles Lettres.' 20 francs.

It was inevitable that a classical series of the compass of the now well-known Guillaume Budé series should contain an edition of Tertullian's *Apology*, and it could not have been entrusted to better hands than those of Waltzing, who has rendered unique services to the study of this book. The volume consists of an admirable introduction, followed by the text, with translation and an excellent *apparatus criticus*, as well as a few comments. In spite of certain defects about to be enumerated, and a certain inequality about the printing, which is on some pages rather indistinct and on others unequal in strength, the edition may be unhesitatingly recommended to all who wish to be introduced to this book.

It is greatly to be regretted that opportunity was not taken to record the readings of the oldest MS., now at Leningrad, of which a page was photographed and published as long ago as 1910. I understand that Waltzing

did obtain a complete photograph of this MS. before his lamented death on August 30, 1929, but it is clear that it did not reach him in time to be used here. If it had, the genealogical tree on p. lvi, good as it is, could have been improved. It is an error (p. liii) to suppose that the Paris MS. 13047 is a portion of the lost Fulda MS. The Paris MS. belonged to Corbie, not to Fulda, as was pointed out by Kroymann himself in *Rheinisches Museum* LXX. (1915), p. 362, and by the present reviewer, independently, in *Journ. Theol. Stud.* XXII. (1920-1), pp. 163 f. The translation is wrong at these points: *plerique* (c. 3) does not, in the Latin of this period, mean 'la plupart'; at the end of c. 14 the joke is not rendered; in c. 16 the play upon the original meaning of the word *tacitus* is lost, as by all other commentators and translators, I believe; the number of §2 in the translation of c. 43 is not in the proper place. There are several passages where the text is susceptible of improvement, and here and there an orthography impossible in Tertullian's time is used.

A. SOUTER.

#### OPPIAN, ATHENAEUS, PLUTARCH.

*Oppian, Colluthus, Tryphiodorus.* With an English translation by A. W. MAIR, D.Litt., Professor of Greek, Edinburgh University. Pp. lxxx + 636.

*Athenaeus, The Deipnosophists.* With an English translation by C. B. GULICK, Ph.D., Eliot Professor of Greek Literature, Harvard University. In seven volumes. II, III. Pp. viii + 533, viii + 510.

*Plutarch's Moralia.* With an English translation by F. C. BABBITT, Trinity College, Hartford, Connecticut. In fourteen volumes. II (86 B-171 F). Pp. xiv + 508.

(Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann; New York: Putnams, 1928-29. Each volume 10s. net in cloth, 12s. 6d. net in leather.)

THE book which Mair had just seen through the press when he died is lavish of introduction and footnotes; and Oppian's verse does not lose on the way to Mair's excellent prose. For these reasons, and because texts of Oppian are hard to come by, the book is necessary to every student of the two poems, and few English-speaking readers will know them in any edition but this for many years to come.

The more pity is it that in some respects the book is not as good as it might easily have been made. For example, those who consult it on the question whether the *Cynegetica* and the *Halieutica* are by different authors will find much to the point (including some just reproof of Christ-Schmid-Stählin), but not all that might well have been said. Much could be made out from a comparison of the language of the two poems, and of their metre; but the only metrical comment that I have noted is in defence of *κλαυθυρισμῶν* at C. iv. 248: 'It is no worse than Lucan's "*distincta zmaragdo*" . . . and even Homer has *ἰλήεντι Ζακύνθῳ* and the like.' When he wrote that, Mair's ear must have been asleep.

The Greek text, again, is not the work of a scholar who is loth to pass over the faults of his MSS. even if he cannot mend them. Not enough conjectures are adopted or quoted, and Mair's own emendations are few; the best, perhaps, are *λυγοῦν* at C. iii. 55 and *Καρύησιν* at C. iv. 267.

Misprints are rather numerous. Some can be corrected at a glance: pp. xli; 1; 6, l. 43; 45, note c; III, note d; 193, note b; 224, l. 179; 469, note; 484, l. 340; 495 (commence<nt>); 502, l. 524; 624, l. 614. A few will give pause: p. 49, note (*Pronuis*—haec una est <catulis> iactura Britannis); p. 190, l. 377 (*διεπέθραδε* for *διεπέφραδε*, a bad word at the best); p. 297, l. 1 ('claps too' for 'claps to'); p. 352, note a (*περιδέα* for *περιδινέα*).

The translation, besides omitting a word or a phrase here and there, has some sins of commission: C. ii. 137, *μέλαν* 'mighty,' 555 *χαράδρην* 'cliff,' H. ii. 472 f. *γενέεσσι* . . . *βελέεσσι* 'jaws . . . jaws,' Coll. 9 *πόντον καὶ γαίαν* 'heaven and earth.' At C. iv. 353 *κρατεροῖσιν* is printed but *κρατεροῖο* translated.

I add a few longer notes and queries. C. ii. 160. Will someone clear up this matter of the bison and the aurochs? Mair's note distinguishes them, and seems to think both extinct in Europe: but *The Times* on 24 August 1929 told us that 'Sweden now has the largest herd of aurochs, or European bisons, in the world.'

H. iii. 312. *ἐμπίπτειν ἐλάτῃσι* is surely *incumbere remis* rather than 'plunge in their oars.' (See Liddell and Scott s.v. *ἐμπίπτω*, 5.)

H. iii. 317. Mair will not allow *ἄμματα* to mean 'ropes,' and interprets the passage in terms of wrestling. But the match between angler and hooked fish is less like a wrestle than a two-some tug-of-war, to which *ὀπισθοφόροι* points.

H. iii. 571. The swordfish behaves stupidly when netted, *οὐδέ οἱ ὄπλον ἐνὶ φρεσίν, οἷον ἄρην ἐκ γενύων*, 'and forgetteth what manner of weapon is set in his jaws.' Perhaps rather 'is worse equipped in his wits than in his jaws': his mind has not a sharp edge to it.

Coll. 134. *δέρκετο μὲν γλαυκῶν βλεφάρων σέλας, ἔδρακε δειρὴν | χρυσῷ δαιδαλέην, ἐφράσσατο κόσμον ἐκάστης*. 'Paris . . . looked at the light of their grey eyes, he looked on the neck arrayed with gold.' Surely *Athena's* eyes and *Aphrodite's* neck (see 84), even though *Hera* is thus given a miss.

Coll. 197. Phereclus, 'the Trojan who built the Wooden Horse (*Il.* V. 59 ff.).' Strange!

Tryph. 2. *καὶ λόχον, Ἀργεῖης ἱππῆ-λατον ἔργον Ἀθῆνης*. The comma should go, so that 'horse-riding' may belong to *λόχον*. Perhaps *Ἀργεῖων* should be read, as in *Eur. Tro.* 534.

Since I have dealt with passages from the two narrative poems, *The Rape of Helen* and *The Taking of Ilios*, which are oddly appended to Oppian here, let me say that Mair's translation is better than they deserved, and that his mythological notes are helpful. But Tryphiodorus and Colluthus are small fry. What matters in this volume is the wealth of zoological lore, from the most diverse sources ancient and modern, that Mair has lavished upon Oppian's *Halieutica*. Scholars who will not read Oppian for his poetry must read this book for what he tells about fish, and for what Mair has added far beyond the needs of the text. The book will be an enduring monument of a gifted scholar and a remarkable man.

Mair's work is ended, but Dr. Gulick is not yet half way through his task. Since the most recent text of Athenaeus

is forty years old, the Loeb Athenaeus, like the Oppian, will mean much to English-speaking students for the next generation or two; and it is not from ingratitude for what Dr. Gulick has done, but in the hope that he will do better, that I shall dwell upon the faults of his work.

His text is poor. He is too partial to the happy-go-lucky conjectures of Mr. T. W. Lumb (though at 227c and 286d Mr. Lumb has done well). His own conjectures are few, and one at least of them is idle. A passage of Alexis, quoted at 164d, describes an actor-cook:

μάλ' εὐφύης ἄνθρωπος. ἐπὶ τραγῳδίαν  
ῥήμηκε νῦν καὶ τῶν μὲν ὑποκριτῶν πολὺ  
κράτιστός ἐστιν ὀψοποιός, ὥς δοκεῖ  
τοῖς χρωμένοις, τῶν δ' ὀψοποιῶν ὑποκριτής.

'Lacunam not. Jacobs,' says Kaibel; 'κάκιστός ἐστι τοῖς θεωμένοις added by Gulick, but more is lost,' is the Loeb editor's note. More, perhaps; but not those words, which blunt the point of 'the best cook among actors and the best actor among cooks.'

The editor is weak upon metre. Many lines that Athenaeus quotes are beyond repair; but his editor should at least mention, if he does not adopt, such conjectures as Porson's *πελιτνὸν* at 107d, which heals the metre of *αἰσχύνεται γὰρ πελιδνὸν ὃν τῷ χρώματι*. At 293d we find 'αὐτὰ added by Gulick,' with this dehiscent trimeter as the result: *ἐμόλυν' ἀλευρῶν αὐτὰ τοιούτῳ τινι*. In *ἀναπεπταμένας ἔχω τῶν ὧτων τὰς πύλας* at 169a 'poetae verba esse vidit Meineke,' but it was left for Dr. Gulick to call the words 'an unidentified iambic line.'

The translation commits some surprising mistakes. 109f: *τῶν ἀποβαλλόντων*, 'men who have cast off.' 120c: *καθιστάμενα* is taken as *καθισταμένας* and the whole sentence is wrecked. 135b: *τρώσας* is translated as if from *τρώγω*. 160e, f: two constructions of *ἀκούω* are confused. 161a: *τῆς δὲ πλείστης τοῦβολοῦ μάξης*, 'costing at the most a ha'penny.' 181e: 'silently, as it were,' for 'as if in a silence.' 189e: *νῦν*, 'in the present instance,' for 'nowadays.' 190c: 'who have displayed goodwill as he had,' for 'who had all alike shewn him goodwill.'

193a: *ἔρχο*, 'thou hast come.' 215d: *αὐτὸς ἀριστείων φησὶν αὐτὸν τετυχηκέναι* translated as if both pronouns referred to Socrates. 216d: *ὃς . . . ὑποτίθεται παρόντα αὐτόν* translated as if *ὃς* and *αὐτόν* referred to different persons. 224a: *φέρουσ'* *ἐξέρχομαι*, 'I am going out to fetch.' 229d: *κεράμῳ παντὶ ἀργυρῷ*, 'every kind of.' 256e: *διαδεξιμένων* treated as a nominative. 268f: *ὀστράκων*, '(scattered by the river banks like) oysters.' 273f: *τὴν σταδίαν μάχην*, 'the war of positions.' 306e: *καὶ οὐ . . . καὶ*, 'not . . . nor.' 308a: *ἀνεγκυσθεὶς δ' οὐ δελεάζεται*, 'nor can he be lured or pulled in.' 316b: *καὶ ταῦτ' ἔχοντα*, 'although he had these,' for 'and that though he had.' 328e: *ὅτε τὰν Σάμῳ δ' ἦν*, 'but when he got to Samos.'

At 254b the line *τοὺς τρεῖς δ' ἐγὼ Σωτήρσιν ἀποδώσεις θεοῖς* stands in the text and 'ἐγὼ Σωτήρσιν ἀποδώσεις θεοῖς Kaibel' in the note.

There is a complex mistake at 270c, where the meaning is, 'You are always famishing, and won't let us partake of good and ample discourse—nay, feed on it; for good discourse is food for the soul.'

At 303c *ὃ καλεῖσθαι ἀθήρα*, accusative and infinitive in a relative clause, is translated 'which is called *athera*,' and a footnote remarks that that word is omitted in the new Liddell and Scott (which, to be sure, does not give to *ἀθήρ* the meaning 'belly-fin').

'Spike-tailed roaches' for *τρυγόνες ὀπισθόκεντροι* at 309d perpetuates a ludicrous error which appears in Liddell and Scott and in Pearson's *Fragments of Sophocles II.*, p. 106; it was pointed out in *The Times Literary Supplement* of 15 December 1921 by Professor D'Arcy Thompson, who derived it from the German 'Roche,' which, if some of our dictionaries are to be believed, means 'roach' as well as 'ray.' Mair's Oppian knows better, just as Mair's Callimachus in this same series is aware that *οὐλος* in the well-known poem on the nautilus does not mean 'with curling feet,' as Dr. Gulick translates it at 318b, that *ἔπεσον* is an aorist, and that the nautilus asks the goddess to give to her votaress not himself but grace.

At 319a it cannot be proved, indeed,



that *παγούροις τοῖς θεοῖς ἐχθροῖσι καὶ ἰχθυοῖσι* means not 'hermit-crabs (detestable in the sight of the gods) and little fishes,' but 'hermit-crabs, detestable to gods and little fishes'; still, Oppian mentions *πάγουροι* among the banes of the finny race, and it is pleasant to think that the familiar combination of gods and little fishes is as old as the New Comedy.

Of the few misprints that I have noticed the only one that will cause trouble is the full stop after *ἀπειπών* at 233b, which adds a new horror to a long sentence that lacks a main verb. In a note on 238f there is a slip in the quotation from Cicero: 'erranti nam non monstrare, quod Athenis execrationibus publicis sanctum est.'

'Erranti viam monstrare' is the purpose of this review.

Since the new Teubner text of Plutarch's *Moralia* already covers 1A-171E and 384D-612B, Mr. Babbitt's work must be judged chiefly by his own con-  
 jec-

tures and by his translation. In his second volume, which ends at 171F, the translation is good except where it drops into verse, and the only notable mistake that I have observed is 'at any rate' for *μέντοι* at 135E. To the text he contributes poor conjectures at 96A, 110E (where his trimeter, like Dr. Gulick's discovery, has a spondee in the fourth foot), 152A, 157B; one that seems to be on the right lines at 159D (*φυραμούχοις*), and good ones at 113C (*καινήν*) and 126E (*κλύσεων*). His preface has some just criticisms of the Teubner editors: but he has not learnt all that he might from them, or he would not have ignored Haupt's *ῥστέον* (AICTEON) for *ἀκτέον* which restores sense and point to 160E (where *ἐπι*, by the way, should be changed to *ἐστι* rather than deleted). They, on the other hand, have something to learn from him, as I said in C.R. XLII. 130.

E. HARRISON.

Trinity College,  
Cambridge.

## CHRISTIAN LATIN POETS.

*Early Christian Latin Poets from the Fourth to the Sixth Century.* By OTTO J. KUHNMUENCH, S.J. Pp. xiv + 472; 42 illustrations. Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1929. \$2.40.

THIS is an honest and praiseworthy endeavour to give a representative selection of the poetry of an obscure period. Father Kuhnmuench does not confine himself to the well-known poets—Ausonius, Prudentius, Ambrose, Venantius Fortunatus—but includes many that are but names to most of us—Victorinus, Severus Sanctus Endecheus, Claudius Marius Victor, and others more obscure still. I think he has the true spirit of an anthologist, and he introduces each of his poets with a brief and reasonable little introduction to his life and works—just enough for the reader to understand the sort of literature he is about to tackle, probably for the first time. There is also a general introduction of some fifteen pages, not very profound, but suitable for those brought up on

strictly classical Latin and now about to begin the study of this later verse.

Fr. Kuhnmuench says with a disarming simplicity: 'All textual criticism was excluded as out of place in a purely literary manual.' This is valid so far as the machinery of establishing a text is concerned, but is no excuse for not printing the best possible text. He comes to no great harm when he reprints from the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, but Dreves is no safe guide; and a hymn taken straight from the *Analecta* can sometimes hardly be construed. Occasionally Fr. K. introduces an additional corruption of his own. In the long alphabetical hymn of Sedulius, *Miracula dedit fidem Habere se Deum patrem* is meaningless; and, so far as I know, there is no MS. variant from *miraculis*. My other chief criticism is of his extraordinary choice of illustrations. About three-quarters of them are Early Christian antiquities, not very well reproduced, from Wilpert's and other standard books, but

eminently suitable as illustrating the poems; while the other quarter are reproductions of sentimental modern religious works by Doré, Thorwaldsen, K. Mueller—they do not even excite a sense of devotion.

I certainly do not wish to end on a note of criticism, so greatly have I enjoyed Fr. K.'s book, and I think that other readers in this country will agree with me. I commend the way he has in many cases added translations, which will greatly help those unfamiliar with this type of literature (and how well John Mason Neale comes out on comparison with the other translators, especially the American Roman Catholics, on whom Fr. K. has sometimes to depend!); and I think he deserves especial praise for boldly tackling in three or four pages the *technopaegnia* of Porphyrius, beside which the

Egg, the Axe, the Altar of the Palatine Anthology pale into simplicity. Figures, in which the *versus intexti* are printed in red, explain how 'the petition, stated in lines 1, 18, and 35, is repeated in the acrostic, mesostic, and telestic, while the other line is given in four symmetrical fragments,' and we are then ready to go on to those—Fr. K. only mentions them, the reader must consult the Teubner edition for them—in which 'the *versus intexti*, if read in the Greek equivalent of the Latin letters, will spell in Homeric hexameters a blessing of Christ on the pious Constantine.' He does, however, print and analyse another poem which is a masterpiece of grammatical and metrical inversions and subtleties, a thousand times more ingenious than 'Torquemada's' best crossword puzzles.

S. GASELEE.

#### A SELECTION FROM THE GREEK ANTHOLOGY.

*The Greek Anthology selected and translated with a Prolegomenon.* By SHANE LESLIE. Pp. 234. London: Ernest Benn, 1929. 8vo. 12s. 6d. net. (Limited édition de luxe, 31s. 6d. net.)

THE practised pen of Mr. Shane Leslie gives us here a prose translation of a large part of the Greek Anthology, nearly a third, being thus larger than Dr. Mackail's selection (which comprises nearly an eighth), but not containing the convenient classification of that book. The Epigrams of each author or period are not brought together; but still amid the huddled mass we can see that Mr. Leslie's judgement is true: 'if there is a Bible portraying the Greeks, as the Old Testament portrays the Jews, it lies less in the Homeric Canon than in the Greek Anthology'; as far, one ought to add, as the literary Roman official or the Byzantine churchman, a Macedonius or a Silentiarius (Epigrammatists several of whose effusions we could well have spared), may be thought to be representative.

As we should expect, there is a tone of distinction in the translation, the sense of beauty in language; a sure touch in phrasing; often a happy

single word like 'enheliate,' 'mountainy' (which pleasingly recalls the 'ould alibi' in the County Leitrim). The sentences too are generally well balanced, but sometimes Mr. Leslie has not shaken off the conventionalism of opening a sentence after a full stop with 'For,' by which he is too fond of rendering γάρ.

Mr. Leslie tells us that he is writing for the *polloi*, as he calls them, and one of his methods is to give some happy modern parallels to enliven the Greek. He reminds us that VII. 591 was the Epigram which was quoted after the death of Lord Kitchener, and that VI. 171 recalls the statue of Liberty at New York, and XVI. 222 the Turkish trophy at Kut. But he is too modest, for his notes show that he can write for the *oligoi* as well. He displays scholarship and taste in the text which he selects, and which, like his translation, we often find superior to Mr. Paton's. Thus *ἐν ὕδατι γράφεσθαι* is superior to *φέρεσθαι*, V. 8, 5—*πρὸς κύμα* (for *κέντρα*) *λακτίζοντες* in Eur. *I. Taur.* 1396 illustrates the error, that is, of altering a proverb—*ἐρύσσατο* to *ἐρίσσατο*, V. 14, 3; *παλλομένη* to *βαλλομένη*, V. 123, 2; *ἐγκροτέουσα* to *οὐ κοτέουσα*, V. 206, 8; *τυλοκόπτους* to

λαποκόπτους, VI. 307, 3. (His numbers throughout.)

With little trouble Mr. Leslie can, in a second edition, suit his book also to the needs of the *oligoi* thus: let him (1) give the reference to the plums which he has skilfully picked out in the Prolegomenon; (2) persuade his publisher to get a little Greek type, and to print Greek words by the side of the English equivalents; (3) add an index or list of his authors, with their approximate dates; (4) and, best of all, let him arrange all the Epigrams under the names of their several authors. A few corrections should be made. The name of Nicarchus is spelt wrongly twice on p. 25. In p. 20 'the pessimism of

Ecclesiasticus' should surely be corrected to 'Ecclesiastes.' To write (p. 21) 'This is the Greek variant for paving Hell with irresolutions' is to fall into a common error: it is not Hell, but the way to Hell, which is paved with them; that is to say, if good resolutions are made, but not kept, then 'facilis descensus Averno,' σκυρωτὰ ὁδός. What the 'pavement' of Avernus is, Plato and Aristophanes tell us: like some of the Anthology, unhappily, it is in Browning's phrase 'immortally immerded.'

J. U. POWELL.

St. John's College,  
Oxford.

### GREEK AND ROMAN BRONZES.

*Greek and Roman Bronzes.* By WINIFRED LAMB, M.A. (Part of the 'Illustrated Library of Archaeology.') Pp. xxiii+261. 96 plates and 37 illustrations in text. London: Methuen and Co., 1929. 25s.

MOST of the literature on bronze figures and decorative bronzes is, as Miss Lamb tells us in her Preface, contained 'in learned periodicals or accounts of excavated sites,' and therefore, we may add, out of the reach of all but specialists. But, if we are inclined to plead this as an excuse for ignorance, the book before us goes far to destroy that plea. It is the object of this review, written by one who is not a specialist for others of the same class, to suggest that Greek and Roman bronzes, as here presented to us, will well repay our study.

The general arrangement of the book is chronological. Questions of technique and of provenance, of fashions in bronzes, of the different classes of articles produced in this metal, are discussed, as occasion offers, within the general chronological scheme. The illustration is full and of admirable quality. There are ample bibliographical references and two useful indexes—one to subjects, one to museums from which objects are cited. Miss Lamb has performed a difficult task with great skill and self-restraint. The necessity of bringing a great mass of

material within a volume of moderate size has forbidden her to enlarge on the interest and beauty of her theme. But even a cursory glance over her pages reveals many flashes of insight and a delicacy of observation that awakens an admiration which further reading will only tend to enhance.

The great advantage of the chronological arrangement is that we are enabled to see, illustrated in a single set of objects, the whole movement of Greek and Roman art. It is the figures that naturally interest us most. From Minoan times we notice a worshipping woman in her close-fitting costume (Pl. VII., *a*). Then come the charmingly awkward animals of the Geometric period (Pl. XIV.). The early archaic period, under Oriental influence, is represented by a group of huntsmen from Crete (Pl. XIX.). From the later archaic period and period of finest art we may pick out for special attention the Athena from the Acropolis (Pl. XLIV., *b*), the vigorous armed runner (Pl. LI., *c*), and the nude male figure of Polyclitean style (Pl. LXI., *b*). To some tastes the finer work of secondary schools may make a special appeal—the archaic Etruscan bronzes (Pl. XXIV., *a*, *b*), the Pan from Arcadia (Pl. LIV., *b*), or the Etruscan Mars (Pl. LXV., *b*). The eye singles out the spinning girl (Pl. LV.) as a

masterpiece, and it is pleasant to find one's judgment confirmed and interpreted in the text. The later periods—Hellenistic and Roman—betray an occasional hesitancy and lapse of taste, but certainly no atrophy of artistic impulse. Notice the charming little girl and puppy (Pl. LXXVI., *a*), the quaint Roman Lar (Pl. LXXXV., *a*), the London archer (Pl. XC., *a*), and the delightful bear and goddess of Berne (Pl. XCII.). The grotesques (Pl. LXXVII.) reveal an interesting, but unhealthy (?), turn towards the ugly and the exceptional—like our modern golliwogs.

One of the most valuable points in a book like this is that it puts out of countenance the idolatry of particular times and particular schools. Obviously

art reaches a higher level in certain ages and in certain places than in others. But that is no excuse for creating artificial 'fine periods,' inside which everything is good and outside which there is no salvation. Almost the most interesting item quoted by Miss Lamb is the famous Ficoronicista (p. 190) with the inscription: 'Dindia Macolnia gave me to her daughter. Novios Plautius made me at Rome.'

We recommend all who are interested in the material background of their classical reading, and can afford the moderate cost of this book, to buy it, to study and enjoy its pictures, and then, as interest grows, to turn to Miss Lamb's text to satisfy and stimulate it again.

H. MATTINGLY.

#### BRITISH MUSEUM GUIDANCE.

1. *A Guide to the Exhibition of Roman Coins in the British Museum*. Pp. 80; 8 plates and 11 figures. 1927. 2s. net.
2. *British Museum: Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities*. A Guide to the Exhibition illustrating Greek and Roman Life. Third edition. Pp. 238; frontispiece and 247 illustrations. 1929. 2s. net.
3. *How to Observe in Archaeology*. Suggestions for Travellers in the Near and Middle East. Second edition. Pp. 120; 46 figures. 1929.

(Printed by order of the Trustees of the British Museum.)

'It is necessary to warn visitors,' says the Preface to the second of these Guides, 'that they must not expect to find the subject in any sense exhaustively treated here: the complete illustration of every detail of ancient life would be impossible for any museum as at present constituted.' Visitors to the British Museum can fend for themselves; it is necessary to warn readers up and down the country that this is only Mr. Walters' little joke. We doubt if any book in existence succeeds in crowding such a variety of information on the most diverse aspects of Greek and Roman life, and such a wealth of well-chosen

illustration, into such compass. The text, which is the work of various members of the Museum staff, is clear and succinct; the illustrations are well reproduced, and there are enough of them to enable the reader to follow the accounts of objects not illustrated. Every school library ought to possess several copies of this Guide; nor could classical students invest two shillings more profitably.

The Guide to the Roman Coins is the work of Mr. Mattingly, and is therefore much more than an Exhibition Guide. The coins are throughout placed in their historical setting, and the figures and plates give a bird's-eye view of coin-types from the *aes signatum* to a gold piece showing Michael VIII. Palaeologus kneeling to be crowned by Christ.

The second edition of *How to Observe in Archaeology*, a manual addressed to the numerous travellers who apply—or ought to apply—to the British Museum for advice how to handle or record the numerous antiquities they will come across in their journeys in the Near and Middle East, has been revised and partly rewritten. Part I. consists mainly of a chapter on "Method," parts of which, we fear, will frighten rather than encourage the traveller who is not a trained and fully equipped



archaeologist, but which also contains such sound advice as this (on inscriptions): 'If there is any chance of being interrupted by any claimant, or by crowds, always make a hand-copy at once, as quickly as possible.' Part II. opens with a section on Stone Age implements, and goes on, in as many

chapters, to tell the traveller what to look for in Greece, Asia Minor, Cyprus, Syria, Palestine, Egypt, Mesopotamia. Iran would be a useful addition in a third edition. There is an appendix on the Laws of Antiquities of the several countries (except Syria), some of which look well on paper.

W. M. CALDER.

*Inscriptions de la Messénie.* Par NATAN S: N VALMIN. (Bulletin de la Société Royale des Lettres de Lund, 1928-1929, IV.) Pp. 48; 4 plates, 14 figs. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1929.

THE author, who has contributed to two recent volumes of the same periodical full accounts of his excavation of prehistoric tombs in Eastern Triphylia, here publishes the epigraphical results of a topographical journey in Messenia. Of the forty-four inscriptions here collected, the most interesting are two decrees of Thuria, engraved on the obverse and reverse of the same stele—one relative to disputes between that city and Megalopolis and their settlement by the arbitration of Patrae, the other granting to Damocharis, a Spartan, various civic and religious honours in recognition of services rendered, or promised, to Thuria. Among the remainder are votives to Apollo Κόρυθος and to Zeus Έπειδάρας, honorary inscriptions to Caracalla and to the Helladarch Tiberius Claudius Crispianus, already known from two Olympian documents, a new fragment enabling us to complete the latter part of the decree I.G. V. 1. 1331, a number of epitaphs and considerable additions, won not without difficulty and risk, to the inscriptions engraved by mariners on the rocky shores of the island of Prote. Slips are not wholly absent—e.g. Τιβ[ήριον] in No. 7 should be Τιβ[ήριον]—but the work has been carried out with commendable thoroughness, and constitutes a valuable contribution to Messenian epigraphy and history.

M. N. TOD.

*The Treasuries of the Greeks and Romans.* By HERBERT NEWELL COUCH. Pp. 112. Menasha, Wisconsin: George Banta, 1929. Cloth, 10s. 6d. (paper, 6s. 6d.).

IN this dissertation the author has brought together a useful collection of information about the storing and hoarding of money and other valuables in ancient Greece and Italy. He opens with a brief introduction on the scope of treasuries and a note on the etymology of *θησαυρός*, which he is inclined to think pre-Greek, though in classical times certainly associated with *τιθήμι*. Next follows a discussion of tholoi, with special reference to the Mycenaean tholoi, and whether they were tombs or treasuries. In this the author rather labours the point, for he concludes: 'The underground structures at Mycenae and Orchomenos were tombs; but they were tombs rich in gold and silver, tombs embodying all the enormous wealth of a royal dynasty. There was nothing

incongruous in their designation as treasuries.' Probably the tholos tombs were called treasuries by Pausanias and others in classical times because of the wealth they contained. The tomb at Dendra, which he does not mention, proves beyond all doubt that the tholoi were tombs even though rich in gold and silver. The sections on the omphalos and on beehives seem rather beside the point, especially the latter. Aristophanes' humorous metaphor *σιμβλος χρημάτων* is hardly evidence, and it is difficult to see why it is significant that Greek peasants to-day call tholos tombs *φούβροι*, ovens, merely because they resemble in shape the ordinary domed oven of modern Greece. The tale from Philostratus, too, can hardly support his theory 'of an ancient association between beehives and treasuries.' The connexion between prisons and treasuries is probably due to little else than the circumstances that both have to be well guarded, and that in a primitive state of society both are apt to be subterranean chambers or deep pits.

The two chapters on temple treasuries in classical times are much more to the point, but might have been expanded very usefully, and the remarks on the so-called treasuries at Delos, Olympia, and Delphi are quite judicious. In a final chapter he deals with smaller treasuries, chests, money boxes, savings banks, thieves, and banking. The last two subjects would have been better omitted, as both deserve detailed treatment. Probably the author would have done better to omit the prehistoric and to confine his dissertation to the classical. The book is certainly useful, but could have been considerably improved, especially by a full index.

A. WACE.

*Die Archäologie des Thukydides.* Von EUGEN TÄUBLER. Pp. ii+139. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1927. Paper, R.M. 6 (bound, 8). *Thukydides und die Weltgeschichte.* Rektoratsrede von Prof. Dr. KONRAT ZIEGLER. (Greifswalder Universitätsreden, 19.) Pp. 21. Greifswald: L. Bamberg, 1928. Paper.

WHY does Thucydides argue for the importance of the Peloponnesian War as he does in his first score of chapters? Mr. Täubler seems to himself to see why: Thucydides was writing 'under the constraint of his literary technique and of his sophistic form of thought.'

When men have been arguing long enough, sooner or later will come the formulation of schemes of argument; and it is no wonder if older arguments prove to conform to the

schemes. Mr. Täubler painfully fits these chapters to a scheme, with its *προϊμιον, πρόθεσις, πύριον* and all. What he does not show is that Thucydides was working upon such a scheme, or why he should have been its slave.

Mr. Täubler has also satisfied himself that Thucydides regarded war as the expression of all the resources of a state, and the history of Greece as a long development inevitably culminating in the Peloponnesian War. Thucydides has concealed these opinions from us, and Mr. Täubler will open the eyes of few.

One who would follow the argument of these chapters had better know a good deal of Greek. Mr. Täubler writes *ἡσσαι* (four times), *ἐγμυνώθησαν*, and *ἀκραφνός*; he translates *οὐκ ἦσαν* by 'nicht zum Wenigsten,' *ἀντρέχοντο τῆς θαλάσσης* by 'leisteten Widerstand zur See'; at ix. 4 he contrives to treat *οὐκ ὄν* as positive; and from his renderings of iii. 1 and 3 it would seem that he sees an optative wherever he sees a verb in *-οι*.

Students who will read all about these chapters that they can find may with patience learn something from the book: but it seems to me an exercise in the discovery of mares'-nests and the hatching of wind-eggs.

The lateness of my review has the advantage that I can now refer to a longer criticism, by Dr. K. Ziegler, in *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* for 18 January 1930.

What Dr. Ziegler can do of his own may be seen in pp. 58-67 of *Rheinisches Museum* for 1929 (a valuable article on the excursus, including the *Ἀρχαιολογία*) and in his excellent *Rektoratsrede*. In the latter he holds the balance fairly between Thucydides and Cleon, and says much else of interest, especially on the historian's over-estimate (as we think it) of the importance of the war. The circumstances of his youth, when Athens had more to fear from her neighbours than from Persia, and the very temper of mind which made him great, may have impaired his perspective of the past.

E. HARRISON.

*Greek Medicine.* Being extracts illustrative of medical writers from Hippocrates to Galen. By A. J. BROCK. Pp. 256. London: J. M. Dent and Sons, 1929. 5s.

THOSE who are already familiar with Dr. Brock's translation of Galen *On the Natural Faculties* will welcome this further contribution of his to our knowledge of the medicine of the Greeks on a wider scale. In this small volume are put together admirably translated excerpts from the more important works of Hippocrates and Galen, together with Thucydides' detailed account of the Plague at Athens, and some quotations from Plato and Aristotle, which Dr. Brock rightly regards as an integral part of Greek medical thought. Each passage has a short explanatory note which describes the position that the writer is either maintaining or attacking.

In the Introduction there is an excellent account of Greek medicine prior to the time of Hippocrates. This is compared with the condition of the pre-Socratic philosophy, and the

influence of Pythagoras and Empedocles is dwelt upon. Also the distinction between the school of Cos, to which Hippocrates belonged, and that of Cnidus is clearly pointed out. The former regarded the patient as a whole, while the latter concentrated its attention on the symptoms and the individual parts of the body, thereby leading to specialisms. This distinction persists in the medical thought and practice of the present day.

Both Hippocrates and Galen laid great stress upon *φύσις*, which should not be translated as 'Nature' but as being essentially equivalent to the organism as a whole, which is ever in contest with the environment; and it is this struggle between the two which at times gives rise to disease.

Nearly half the book is wisely devoted to extracts from the voluminous writings of Galen, skilfully selected so that they may interest the lay reader nearly as much as the physician. After reading them one begins to understand why Galen reigned supreme in medicine for some fourteen hundred years. This was not due to the sheer stupidity and obscurantism of the Middle Ages, but to the intrinsic merit of Galen himself. For he was very much more than a physician. Not only had he a wide philosophic outlook and a keen logical intellect, but he was one of those all-embracing minds like Leonardo da Vinci, Leibnitz, and Goethe, which take all knowledge for their province. His writings seemed to furnish an answer for every question, a solution for every difficulty. Doubtless his teleological views and the slightly mystical element attaching to *φύσις* may have commended him to the mediaeval Church.

The comparison of Galen with St. Paul, though suggestive, seems rather overstrained.

The Greek text used for Hippocrates is that of Littre; that used for Galen is the edition of Kühn. R. O. MOON.

*Hellenistic Poetry.* By ALFRED KOERTE. Translated by Jacob Hammer and Moses Hadas. With a preface by Edward Delavan Perry. Pp. xviii+437. New York: Columbia University Press, 4 dollars; London: Humphrey Milford, 1929. 20s.

PROFESSOR KOERTE'S *Hellenistische Dichtung*, published in 1925 and costing three marks, is one of the popular and miscellaneous series known as *Kroeners Taschenausgabe*, and, perhaps for that reason, did not reach the C.R. After a brief introduction, it deals with the New Comedy, Elegy, Epic, Alexandrian Drama, Mime, and Epigram, illustrating these forms with verse translations often several pages in length, and adding pleasantly written and judicious criticism of the various authors and of their times. The book was not addressed to scholars, and is therefore devoid of footnotes and even of references for the passages translated, but it may well be read with profit by students in search of a somewhat fuller treatment of the period than they can find, for example, in Professor Murray's *Greek Literature*. It deserved to be translated.

To judge from the bibliography which has

been added, this somewhat expensive American translation is addressed rather to students than to the general public, and it would therefore have been well to add references also. The translators have substituted for the verse passages English verse renderings by various hands and of various merit. Sometimes, however, where a point mentioned by Koerte is omitted in the version chosen, they have been obliged to add a prose translation. Twice (pp. 383, 385) they have omitted to do so, and the comment is unintelligible. Their own version of the German is here and there a little stiff, but for the most part readable enough. I have not compared it minutely with the original, but a sentence which puzzled me on p. 15 proved to be a misleading translation; and a German professor would hardly have written (p. 346; of Herodas, *Mime 6*) 'The matter is so infamous that even scholars at first had no inkling of it.' Koerte's adjective was in fact *gemein*.

A. S. F. GOW.

*Pagan Regeneration: A Study of Mystery Initiations in the Graeco-Roman World.* By HAROLD R. WILLOUGHBY. Pp. xi+307. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1929. 13s. 6d. net.

THE author of this little work is Associate Professor of New Testament Literature at Chicago. His studies have shown him the need for a sound knowledge of the non-Christian religious ideas of the early centuries of our era, and it would appear from the preface that his book to some extent represents lectures delivered to his students. It has the virtues and defects that might be looked for in a treatise on a difficult subject written by a man of good sense whose special knowledge is of a different branch. There are no gross errors, and the author does not seek to uphold wildly absurd views, or to be original in fields where he cannot claim close first-hand acquaintance with the evidence. He has used good authorities, for the most part, including some reference to the original documents; but the book is hardly more than a compilation not always accurate in detail. For instance (p. 3), the cultured Athenian audience that listened to St. Paul in Athens was no more 'typical' of the Gentile world of that day than the staff of a modern university would be of the country to which it belonged. It is somewhat rash to assume (p. 26) that Pindar was a 'devout Orphic.' To speak of the initiation of 'Lucius Apuleius' (p. 31) is to blend the writer of the *Golden Ass* with his hero. That the famous apartment in the Villa Item is a 'private Orpheum' (p. 109) remains to be proved; so do Dieterich's identification of the ritual in the great Paris papyrus with a liturgy of Mithra (p. 163), and Scott's resolution of the *Asclepius* into three treatises (p. 197). And those readers who know anything of Latin literature will smile wryly on being told (p. 110) that Statius, *Silu.* II. 7, is addressed to 'the widow of a certain Lucan.'

Misprints are numerous, the price seems high, and, to be brutally frank, it is not clear what

need there is for this book when we have already Halliday's *Pagan Background* and the works of Cumont.

H. J. ROSE.

*Symbola in novam Eunapii Vitarum editionem, specimen litterarum inaugurale, quod . . . examini submittet* IOANNES CORNELIUS VOLLEBREGT, Haganus . . . Amstelodami, apud H. J. Paris, 1929. Pp. viii+142.

THE oldest preserved MS. of Eunapius' *Vitae* is a Medicean MS. of the fourteenth century, and there are fifteen later MSS., of which four have been made known for the first time by Vollebregt, while the other eleven were discussed by Albert Jordan in 1888. In the present work, which shows critical power, there is much that is indispensable to the future editor. Not only has the author examined many passages in detail, but he has collected a number of notes on the text by great scholars of the past like J. J. Scaliger, Is. Vossius, Tib. Hemsterhusius, I. C. Valckenaer, David Ruhnken, Daniel Wyttenbach, and C. G. Cobet, who did not publish their notes but merely recorded them in their own copies of the text. A chapter classifies the *clausulae* in Eunapius, and the work ends with a list of *theses* and an index. The two emendations of passages in Augustine's *Confessions* may be pronounced certain. This book arouses great expectations of future work from the author's pen.

A. SOUTER.

*Cornelii Taciti Historiarum Libri III.-IV.* Recensuit MAXIMUS LENCHANTIN DE GUBERNATIS. Pp. xii+179. Turin: G. B. Paravia and Co., 1929. L. 14 net.

IN editing the second volume of the *Histories* for the Paravia Series, Signor Lenchantin wisely stands by the general verdict of scholars, 'principem locum ad textum restituendum codicem Mediceum alterum obtinere,' and rejects outright the recent attempt of F. Grät to elevate *Vaticanus* 1958 above M. The text which he offers is a reasonable one, and a commendably full *Apparatus Criticus* often supplies information which was not available when Fisher edited the *Histories* for the O.C.T.

There seem to be twenty-two passages where the editor has printed a new suggestion of his own or retained the reading of M against the Vulgate. In six instances he may well be right—viz. 3. 65. 6. (O.C.T. numeration) adfectam eius fidem *praecavisse*; 3. 67. 9. *sua* ferebatur; 3. 71. 8. fama, *in* nitentis ac progressos depulerint; 4. 5. 6. non ut, *sicut* plerique; 4. 5. 8. sapientiae *tum*; 4. 65. 15. in vetustatem consuetudine (so M.). In nine passages the editor's reading is as probable as anything else suggested, viz. 3. 6. 10. Ravennatis <minas>; 3. 13. 21. etiam militibus principem auferre. *milites* integros (a suggestion in the *App. Crit.* and better than the reading printed in the text); 3. 50. 11. *ad omnia* quae (asyndeton); 3. 55. 12. beneficiorum *haeserat*; 3. 62. 6. <erecto> animo; 4. 5. 4. regione Italiae, *Carecino* e municipio Cluviis; 4. 12. 10. nec opibus Romanis, societate validiorum (asyndeton);

4. 12. 14 [nandi]; 4. 35. 19. <proditos> desertosque. In seven passages the reading appears definitely wrong, viz. 3. 2. 27. *reseratam militiam*; 3. 5. 10. *fidei quam commilitii*; 3. 24. 3. *cur raptim resumpsissent*; 4. 15. 13. *oblocata Oceano*; 4. 29. 7. *cursus intercepti*; 4. 58. 3. *hostium* (retained); 5. 9. 4-5. *civili interno* (retained). In 3. 66. 5-7. Lenchantin offers the same reading as the O.C.T. except that he prints a semicolon instead of a comma after *pateretur*. This reading forces us to give a very abnormal meaning to *superbiam*. Surely we should read *Vespasiani* for *Vespasiano* and translate: '(They declared that) even though vanquished they would not tolerate such an act of arrogance on Vespasian's part as that he should suffer Vitellius to survive as a private person; thus their pity (i.e. for Vitellius) would bring danger (i.e. to themselves).' The volume includes eight fragments from the *Histories* and a useful *Index nominum*.

E. A. BARBER.

*Ein Proklosfund und seine Bedeutung.* Von RAYMOND KLIBANSKY. Pp. 41. Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1929. RM. 2.40.

As is generally known, the text of the commentary of Proclus on the *Parmenides*, as given by its editors, Cousin and Stallbaum, and by the MSS. on which their editions are based, breaks off abruptly at *Parm.* 141e 2-10. Hitherto it has been uncertain whether this represents the real end of the work, or whether Proclus carried his comments right through the dialogue. Mr. Klibansky's brochure, an extract from the *Proceedings* of the Heidelberg Akademie der Wissenschaften, calls attention to the fact that the mediaeval Latin translation carries the commentary down to the end of the first 'hypothesis' of the dialogue, and there presents a formal conclusion of the work. It is thus certain that Proclus pursued his formal exposition no further. His exegesis of the remaining 'hypotheses' was purposely given in a subsequent separate work—the six books of the *Platonic Theology*. The author adds interesting details about various MSS. of the Latin version which contain the conclusion (its author was—probably though not certainly—William of Morbeke), and their owners, as well as some well-written pages about the influence of the commentary in the Middle Ages, as the source of the—mistaken—belief that Plato is the founder of 'negative theology,' and the value of the work, both in Greek and in the version, as evidence for the Platonic text. Specimens of the version are appended. Since the printed texts of the work of Proclus are notoriously full of errors of every kind, it is much to be wished that both the Greek and the Latin version should be carefully edited for publication. (I note one small oversight in a footnote to p. 17. It is complained there that 'critical texts' of the

*Parmenides* make no use of the important Vienna MS. W. This was true until recently, but since the edition of the dialogue by Diès in the *Collection des Universités de France* it is true no longer.)  
A. E. TAYLOR.

*Latin Thought during the Middle Ages.* By CESARE FOLIGNO. Pp. viii+120; 6 illustrations. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1929. 5s. net.

PROFESSOR FOLIGNO'S interesting book is a brief essay on the continuity of the Latin tradition in the period between the decline of the ancient world and the Renaissance. The first chapter deals with the Roman impress on the Middle Ages. 'It used to be said, "Scratch a Russian and you will find a Cossack" . . . It would certainly be true to say, "Scratch a cultured man of the Middle Ages and you will find a Roman at heart."' Then the author proceeds to describe the 'salvage' of Latin culture from the wreck of antiquity, and estimates the contribution of the Christian Church to the new order. There is a good account of the time of Boëthius and of Cassiodorus, and then we are introduced to what is (somewhat unhappily for English readers) called the 'Scottish' age, i.e. the age of the Irish scholars. The Carolingian revival of learning is next described, and the book ends with a chapter entitled 'The Schoolmen and After.'

The real value of this small volume is to be sought in its new and suggestive treatment of old facts, which are not grouped quite in the familiar manner. I cannot help thinking that it suffers from compression, and, although it may seem ungracious to say so, from a certain obscurity due to the fact that the author is not employing his native idiom. If, as the book deserves, it reaches a second edition, there are several corrections which might well be made. P. 15, there are misprints in a quotation from Horace; p. 23, Claudian is hardly to be classed among 'African' authors; p. 29, Stilicho was a Vandal, not a Goth, and (p. 10) he did not defend the empire against 'Huns and Vandals'; p. 29, Aetius was rather a Roman than a barbarian; p. 51, Stewart and Sandys were not the first to assert that the 'great quarrel of the Universals' primarily depended on a point raised by Boëthius; p. 70, Sidonius was not, strictly speaking, Bishop of Clermont, but of Auvergne or of the Arverni; p. 73, Maximian, Paul the Deacon and Peter of Pisa do not belong to the seventh century; p. 74, it is unlikely that Muadwin (Modoin) was an Englishman; p. 105, for John read Robert Grosseteste.

The bibliographical note is useful, but contains several errors and misprints. Hörle's *Frühmittelalterliche Mönchs- und Klerikerbildung in Italien*, Freiburg-i.-B., 1914, might be added to it. The six fine illustrations add greatly to the attractiveness of Professor Foligno's book.

F. J. E. RABY.



## SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

## CLASSICAL WEEKLY (NEW YORK).

(1930.)

ARCHAEOLOGY.—January 6. O. L. Spaulding, H. Nickerson and J. W. Wright, *Warfare: A Study of Military Methods from the Earliest Times* [New York: Harcourt and Brace, 1925] (W. A. Oldfather). Praised as the work of men who have had practical experience of warfare. The first 265 pp. deal with antiquity: O. criticises details.—January 20. A. Köster, *Das Antike Seewesen* [Berlin: Schoetz und Parrhysius, 1923] (W. A. Oldfather). An admirable book, well illustrated.—February 3. A. W. Lawrence, *Later Greek Sculpture* [New York: Harcourt and Brace, 1927] and *Classical Sculpture* [London: Cape, 1929] (A. D. Fraser). Praised. In both books L. aims at determining the correlation of extant works of art, and follows his own judgment, which is always illuminating, if not convincing.—February 24. Tatiana Warsher, *Pompeii in Three Hours* [Rome: Industria Tipografica Imperia, 1930] (A. W. Van Buren). A guide of 156 pp., with 100 illustrations: highly praised.

GRAMMAR, ETC.—January 27. H. C. Elmer, *Latin Grammar* [New York: Macmillan, 1928] (B. W. Mitchell). Long and controversial review, favourable on the whole.—March 10. E. K. Rand, *A Survey of the Manuscripts of Tours* [2 vols. Cambridge, Mass.: The Mediaeval Academy of America, 1929] (L. W. Jones). Vol. II. contains 200 collotype plates. A comprehensive treatment of one of the most important centres of mediaeval writing.

HISTORY.—C. Torr, *Hannibal Crosses the Alps* [Cambridge University Press, 1924] and A. R. Bonus, *Where Hannibal Passed* [London: Methuen, 1925] (E. B. Lease). L. professes himself convinced by B.'s autopsy, though his theory is novel.

LITERATURE.—January 20. T. Hudson-Williams, *Early Greek Elegy* [Cardiff: University of Wales Press Board, 1926] (A. G. C. Maitland). An admirable edition of the fragments, with introduction and commentary.—January 27. W. A. Edward, *The Suasoriae of Seneca the Elder* [Cambridge University Press, 1928] (J. Hammer). The first English edition with translation and commentary. Praised.—February 24. F. G. Allinson, *Lucian, Satirist and Artist* [New York: Longmans and Green, 1926, in 'Our Debt to Greece and Rome'] (B. E. Perry). A very able book.—March 10. H. St. J. Thackeray, *Josephus: The Man and the Historian* [New York: Jewish Institute of Religion Press, 1929] (M. Hadas). Lectures delivered at the Institute. T.'s most original point is the distinction he attempts to draw between the language of J. himself and that of his Greek assistants.

[The issues of January 13, January 20, and March 3 contain lists of classical articles in non-classical periodicals.]

## MUSÉE BELGE, XXXIII. Nos. 7-10,

JULY-OCTOBER, 1929.

L. Halkin, *A la mémoire de Jean Pierre Waltzing* (1857-1929). A. Severyns, *Un nouveau livre sur Platon*. Analysis of J. Burnet, *Platonism*, 1928. J. Meunier, *Euripide et la critique moderne*. Discusses interpretation of *Alc.* 304, 636-42; *Med.* 160, 214-8, 355, 627; *Tro.* 869; *Iph. in T.* 1467, 1010. In the last, ἦξω . . . πρὸς οἶκον, translate: 'si je descends moi aussi sous la terre, j'y retrouverai du moins un foyer.' A section, 'E. et la doctrine socratique de la vertu,' deals with *Suppl.* 913, *Iph. in Aul.* 558-67, *H.F.* 344-7. P. van de Woestyne, *Un traducteur de Théophraste: Jean de la Bruyère*. P. Faider, *Sénèque et Britannicus*. The death of B. took Seneca by surprise. The *De Clementia* was not written to divert Nero from the crime. F. Gaffiot, *Infinitif de but et de relation. Gérondif et adjectif en -ndus*. Ch. de Trooz, *La critique de Virgile dans les Commentaires de Servius*. S. judges by precepts traditional in the schools: his criticism is external and passionless: 'de Virgile poète quelque chose lui échappe, qui est justement la poésie.'

## PHILOLOGISCHE WOCHENSCHRIFT.

(JANUARY-MARCH, 1930.)

GREEK LITERATURE.—*Isocrate Discours, Tome I.* Texte ét. et trad. par G. Mathieu et E. Brémond [Paris, 1928, Les Belles Lettres. Pp. 202] (Drerup). Introduction is the most successful part. Commentary often insufficient and needs enlarging. Critical apparatus dangerously incomplete and unmethodical. Long review.—W. Schadewaldt, *Die Geschichtschreibung des Thukydides* [Berlin, 1929, Weidmann. Pp. viii+100] (Ziegler). First part deals with date of composition of Books 6 and 7. In the second part the bigger question of Thucydides' whole mental development is discussed. Reviewer considers S.'s presentation of this new problem very important both for the student and for the ordinary reader of Thucydides.—U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Die Heimkehr des Odysseus. Neue Homerische Untersuchungen* [Berlin, 1927, Weidmann. Pp. viii+205] (Drerup). This 'new' theory contains very little that is new, and is really a defence of an old position. Unfavourably reviewed.

LATIN LITERATURE.—K. Sprey, *De M. Tullii Ciceronis politica doctrina* [Diss. Amsterdam,

1928. Pp. 263] (Klotz). Ripe fruit of penetrating research. Confirms Heinze's view about Cicero's ideal constitution; the *princeps* is not a monarch, nor is ideal state governed by one man.—P. I. Enk, *Handboek der Latijnsche Letterkunde*. I. [Zutphen, 1928, Thieme and Co. Pp. 319] (Helm). E.'s object of bringing out the native Roman element and of laying stress on the artistic value of the literary works that have survived has been fully achieved. Deals with early period to 240 B.C. Sound judgment and skilful instruction combined with warmth of feeling and understanding penetration.—*Cornelii Taciti Historiarum libri III-V*. Ad fidem codicis Medicei rec. M. Lenchantin de Gubernatis [Turin, 1929, Paravia] (Gude-man). Substantial scholarly work. L. has a special gift for textual criticism.
- HISTORY.**—E. Ciaceri, *Storia della Magna Grecia*. Vol. I. *La fondazione delle colonie greche e Pellenisamento di città nell'Italia antica*. Sec. ed. Vol. II. *La grande civiltà del mezzogiorno d'Italia; sviluppo, potenza ed azione politica degli stati italici dal sec. VII. alla metà del sec. IV*. [Milan, 1927-8, Albrighi, Segati and Co. Pp. xvi+401, and xv+476] (Ziebarth). Rich collection of archaeological and literary material illustrating in detail the history of the Greek cities of Magna Graecia, including their agriculture, industries, trade, etc.—A. Ferrabino, *La dissoluzione della libertà della Grecia antica* [Padua, 1929, Cedam. Pp. 118] (Lenschau). Ingenious and interesting, though not always convincing.—J. Stroux and L. Wenger, *Die Augustus-Inschrift auf dem Marktplatz von Kyrene* [Abh. d. Bayr. Akad. d. Wiss., Munich, 1928. Pp. 145] (Ebrard). Contains bibliography, text and translation, notes on language and style, and chapters on population of Cyrenaica, administration, and legal procedure. Equally full of interest for classical philologists, historians, and lawyers.—K. Ohly, *Stichometrische Untersuchungen* [Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen, Beiheft 61. Leipzig, 1927, Harrassowitz. Pp. 131] (Birt). Long review by Birt, who has much to criticize, but expresses thanks for O.'s instructive and stimulating book, which no one interested in the subject can afford to neglect.—W. Gieseke, *Italia Numismatica. Eine Geschichte der italischen Geldsysteme bis zur Kaiserzeit* [Leipzig, 1928] (Küthmann). This book has the great merit of closely combining the development of Italian coinage with the political development of Italy. But reviewer does not agree with all of G.'s views.—E. Groag, *Hannibal als Politiker* [Vienna, 1929, Seidel. Pp. 158] (Taeger). G. combines fine historical feeling with comprehensive mastery of ancient tradition and modern research. Reviewer welcomes the book, and makes some additions and corrections.
- LANGUAGE.**—E. des Places, *Études sur quelques particularités de liaison chez Platon* [Paris, 1929, Budé] (Schmid). Deals with *oov*, *ἀπα*, and *τολῶν*, and their combinations with other particles. Exhaustive and thoroughly reliable. Useful alphabetical and chronological indices.—A. Meillet, *Esquisse d'une histoire de la langue latine* [Paris, 1928, Hachette. Pp. viii+286] (Niedermann). Main object of the book is to show how Roman politics and culture influenced the development of the Latin language. M.'s encyclopaedic knowledge, breadth of vision, and power of artistic construction are again brilliantly revealed.—B. Laum, *Das alexandrinische Akzentuations-system unter Zugrundelegung der theoretischen Lehren der Grammatiker und mit Heranziehung der praktischen Verwendung in den Papyri* [Paderborn, 1928, Schöningh. Pp. xvi+523, and 3 plates] (E. Hermann). In spite of reservations reviewer considers this book a very substantial and well-founded work. Especially important for scholia on Homer, origin of certain grammatical terms, etc. But B.'s solution of the problem of the grave accent is unsatisfactory; a far more thoroughgoing examination of papyri is required.—H. Hirt, *Indogermanische Grammatik. Teil V.: Der Akzent* [Heidelberg, 1929, Winter. Pp. xii+411] (Gerullis). This is in a sense a second edition of H.'s 'Der Indogermanische Akzent' of 1895. But the revision is so thorough that it is really a new book. In spite of weaknesses it will be welcomed with gratitude and appreciation.
- PAPYROLOGY.**—H. Frisk, *Papyrus grecs de la Bibliothèque Municipale de Gothenbourg* [Göteborg, 1929. Pp. 58, and 2 plates] (K. F. W. Schmidt). The 112 Greek papyri in the municipal library at Göteborg are described with circumspection and expert knowledge.

## BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on classical studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

\*.\* Excerpts or extracts from periodicals and collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.

*Ad astra et Res multum dissonae verbis*. Carmina in certamine poetico Hoeufftiano magna laude ornata. Edidit Academia Regia Disciplinarum Nederlandica. Amsterdam, 1929. Paper.

Agard (W. R.) The Greek Tradition in

Sculpture. Pp. 59; 35 illustrations. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press (London: Milford), 1930. Cloth, 13s. 6d. net.

Bates (W. N.) Euripides, a student of human nature. Pp. xiii+315; x plates, 15 figures. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania

- Press (London: Milford), 1930. Cloth, 21s. net.
- Blakeney (E. H.)** Twenty-Four Hymns of the Western Church. The Latin text, with a Verse Rendering of each Hymn, a brief Introduction, Commentary, and Appendices. Edited by E. H. B. Pp. xvii + 103. London: Eric Partridge, 1930. Cloth, 16s. net.
- Böhme (J.)** Die Seele und das Ich im homerischen Epos. Pp. vi + 132. Leipzig: Teubner, 1929. Paper, RM. 8.
- Bourguery (A.) et Ponchont (M.)** Lucain. Tome II. Livres VI-X. Texte établi et traduit. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1929. Paper, 30 fr.
- Brix-Niemeyer.** Ausgewählte Komödien des T. Maccius Plautus. Erklärt von B.-N. Drittes Bändchen. Menaechmi. 6. Auflage bearbeitet von F. Conrad. Pp. 104. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1929. Paper, RM. 3.20 (bound, 3.80).
- Broadbent (U.)** Agis King of Sparta. A Play in Four Acts. Pp. 160. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1930. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Bury (J. B.)** Selected Essays. Edited by H. Temperley. Pp. xxxi + 249. Cambridge: University Press, 1930. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.
- Campbell (J. M.)** The Greek Fathers. Pp. ix + 167. (Our Debt to Greece and Rome.) London: Harrap, 1929. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Caplan (H.)** Gianfrancesco Pico della Mirandola on the Imagination. The Latin text with an introduction, an English translation, and notes. Pp. xi + 102. (Cornell Studies in English, XVI.) New Haven: Yale University Press (London: Milford), 1930. Paper, 4s. 6d. net.
- Carcopino (J.)** Virgile et le Mystère de la IV<sup>e</sup> Églogue. Pp. 221. Paris: 'L'Artisan du Livre,' 1930. Paper, 15 fr.
- Carpenter (R.)** The Sculpture of the Nike Temple Parapet. With photographs by B. Ashmole. Pp. 83. Cambridge (U.S.A.): Harvard University Press, 1929. Cloth, \$2.
- Constantinescu (E.)** Prologus la Comediile lui Plautus. Pp. 115. (Universitatea din Iași. Facultatea de Filosofie și Litere.) Jassy: Tip. "Gutenberg," 1929. Paper.
- Dîts (A.)** Platon. Pp. 221. (Les Grands Cœurs.) Paris: Flammarion, 1930. Paper, 12 fr.
- Donnay (M.)** Lysistrata. A comedy in four acts. Translated from the French by W. A. Drake. With a foreword by G. J. Nathan. Pp. 140. New York and London: Knopf, 1929. Boards, 7s. 6d.
- Duncan (G. S.)** St. Paul's Ephesian Ministry. A reconstruction, with special reference to the Ephesian origin of the Imprisonment Epistles. Pp. xiv + 303. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1929. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.
- Eisler (R.)** Ἰησοῦς βασιλεὺς οὐ βασιλεύσας. Lieferung 19. Pp. 769-884 and title-pages etc. of vol. II. Heidelberg: Winter, 1930. Paper, RM. 8.50.
- Field (G. C.)** Plato and his Contemporaries. A study in fourth-century life and thought. Pp. xi + 242. London: Methuen, 1930. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.
- Fiore (T.)** La Poesia di Virgilio. Pp. 311. Bari: Laterza, 1930. Paper, L. 20.
- Fraser (J. G.)** Graecia Antiqua. Maps and plans to illustrate Pausanias's Description of Greece. Compiled by Sir J. G. F., with explanatory text by A. W. van Buren. Pp. xii + 160; lviii sheets or pages of maps and plans. London: Macmillan, 1930. Cloth, 25s. net.
- Goldmann (E.)** Beiträge zur Lehre vom indogermanischen Charakter der etruskischen Sprache. II. Teil. Pp. xiv + 397. Heidelberg: Winter, 1930. Paper, M. 21.
- Goodenough (E. R.)** The Jurisprudence of the Jewish Courts in Egypt. Legal administration by the Jews under the early Roman Empire as described by Philo Judaeus. Pp. ix + 268. New Haven: Yale University Press (London: Milford), 1929. Cloth, 13s. 6d. net.
- Harder (R.)** Ueber Ciceros Somnium Scipionis. (Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft, Geisteswissenschaftliche Klasse, 6. Jahr, Heft 3.) Pp. 115-151. Halle (Saale): Niemeyer, 1929. Paper, RM. 3.
- Hardie (R. P.) and Gaye (R. K.)** The Works of Aristotle translated into English. Physica. Oxford: Clarendon Press (London: Milford), 1930. Paper, 10s. 6d. net.
- Herrlinger (G.)** Totenklage um Tiere in der antiken Dichtung. Mit einem Anhang byzantinischer, mittellateinischer und neu-hochdeutscher Tierepikeden. Pp. x + 188. (Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft, 8. Heft.) Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1930. Paper, RM. 12.
- Hope (R.)** The Book of Diogenes Laertius. Its Spirit and Its Method. Pp. xiv + 241. New York: Columbia University Press (London: Milford), 1930. Cloth, 17s. 6d. net.
- Hude (C.)** Xenophontis Historia Graeca. Recensuit C. H. Editio maior. Pp. xii + 343. Leipzig: Teubner, 1930. Bound, RM. 8 (unbound, 6.80).
- Jackson (T.)** Titus Lucretius Carus on the Nature of Things. Translated by T. J. Pp. 244. Oxford: Blackwell, 1929. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- James (A. I.)** The Potential Subjunctive in Independent Sentences in Livy. Pp. viii + 68. (Smith College Classical Studies, No. 10.) Northampton (Mass., U.S.A.), 1929. Paper.
- Janell (W.)** P. Vergili Maronis opera post Ribbeckium tertium recognovit Gualtherus Janell. Editio maior iterum recognita. Pp. xxviii + 428. (Bibl. Scr. Gr. et Rom. Teubn.) Leipzig: Teubner, 1930. Cloth, RM. 7 (unbound, 5.60).
- John Burnet.** 1863-1928. Pp. 28. From the Proceedings of the British Academy, Vol. XIV. London: Milford. Paper, 2s. net.
- Jullian (C.)** Au seuil de notre Histoire. Leçons faites au Collège de France. I. 1905-1914. Pp. 256. Paris: Boivin. Paper, 20 fr.
- Kapmukajas (C. K.)** Die Nachahmungstechnik Senecas in den Choraliedern des Hercules Furens und der Medea. Pp. x + 158. Borna-Leipzig: Noske, 1930. Paper.
- Kristeller (P. O.)** Der Begriff der Seele in der Ethik des Plotin. Pp. vii + 110. (Heidel-

- berger Abh. zur Philosophie u. ihrer Geschichte, 19.) Tübingen: Mohr, 1929. Paper, M. 6.
- Landi* (C.) Demogorgone. Con saggio di nuova edizione delle "Genologie deorum gentium" del Boccaccio e silloge dei frammenti di Teodonzio. Pp. 118. Palermo: Sandron, 1930. Paper, L. 15.
- Levens* (R. G. C.) A Book of Latin Letters, chosen and annotated. Pp. xxii+174. London: Methuen, 1930. Cloth, 3s. 6d.
- MacKellar* (W.) The Latin poems of John Milton, edited with an introduction, an English translation, and notes. Pp. xii+382. (Cornell Studies in English, XV.) New Haven: Yale University Press (London: Milford), 1930. Paper, 13s. 6d. net.
- Martha* (J.) Cicéron. Des termes extrêmes des biens et des maux. Tome II. Livres III-V. Texte établi et traduit. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1930. Paper, 20 fr.
- Macrogiordato* (J.) The Erotokritos. With an Introduction by S. Gaselee. Pp. vii+61. London: Milford, 1929. Paper, 3s. net.
- May* (T. H. D.) The Aeneid of Virgil. Literally rendered into English Blank Verse (with the Text opposite). Pp. 623. (Broadway Translations.) London: Routledge (New York: Dutton). Cloth and vellum, 12s. 6d. net.
- Novotný* (F.) Platonis Epistulae commentariis illustratae. Pp. vii+319. (Opera Facultatis Philosophicae Universitatis Masarykianae Brunensis, 30.) Brno, 1930. Paper, Kč 50.
- Oltramare* (P.) Sénèque: Questions naturelles. Tome I (Livres I-III), Tome II (Livres IV-VII). Texte établi et traduit. (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1929. Paper.
- Papers of the British School at Rome.* Vol. XI. Pp. xi+136; xxviii plates, 79 illustrations in text. London: Macmillan, 1929. Cloth and boards, 63s.
- Patterson* (R. F.) Irregular Latin Verbs. Pp. 16. London and Glasgow: Blackie, 1929. Limp cloth, 6d.
- Pendlebury* (J. D. S.) Aegyptiaca. A catalogue of Egyptian objects in the Aegean area. Pp. ix+121; IV plates, III maps. Cambridge: University Press, 1930. Cloth, 15s. net.
- Rand* (E. K.) Studies in the Script of Tours, I. A survey of the manuscripts of Tours. Vol. I, text, pp. xxii+245; Vol. II, plates (200). Cambridge (U.S.A.): The Mediaeval Academy of America, 1929. Buckram, \$50.
- Rostagni* (A.) Arte poetica di Orazio. Introduzione e Commento di A. R. Pp. cxii+133. (Biblioteca di Filologia classica.) Turin: Chiantore, 1930. Paper, L. 28.
- Stevenson* (G. H.) The Roman Empire. Pp. 255; illustrations. (The "Teaching of History" Series.) London, Edinburgh, and New York: Nelson, 1930. Cloth, 2s. 6d.
- Symbolae Osloenses*, Fasc. VIII. Ediderunt S. Eitrem et G. Rudberg. Pp. 129. Oslo: Some, 1929. Paper.
- Tarn* (W. W.) Hellenistic Civilisation. Second edition. Pp. viii+334. London: Arnold, 1930. Cloth, 16s. net.
- The Bacchae* of Euripides. The Greek text as performed at Cambridge - , 4-8 March 1930 by members of the University, together with an English prose translation by D. W. Lucas. Pp. 95. Cambridge: Bowes and Bowes, 1930. Paper, 3s. net.
- The Economic History Review.* Vol. II. No. 2. January, 1930. London: Black. 10s. 6d. net.
- The Year's Work in Classical Studies*, 1928-1929. Edited by S. G. Owen. Pp. x+136. Bristol: Arrowsmith, 1929. Paper, 3s. 6d. net.
- Thielscher* (P.) Unser Wissen um Jesus. Ein neuer Weg der Quellenuntersuchung. I. Die Selbstentfaltung des Stoffes in den vier Evangelien. Pp. 442. Gotha: L. Klotz, 1930. Paper, 12 marks.
- Thierfelder* (A.) De rationibus interpolationum Plautinarum. Pp. vi+160. Leipzig: Teubner, 1929. Cloth, RM. 12 (unbound, 10).
- Thursby* (C. C.) and *Kyne* (G. D.) Living Latin for the Junior High School. Book Two. Pp. xxi+623; illustrations. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1929. Cloth.
- Toutain* (J.) The Economic Life of the Ancient World. Pp. xxvii+361; 6 maps. (The History of Civilization.) London: Kegan Paul, 1930. Cloth, 16s. net.
- Trowbridge* (M. L.) Philological Studies in Ancient Glass. Pp. 206. (University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature. Vol. XIII, Nos. 3-4.) Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1930. Paper.
- Turyn* (A.) De Aelii Aristidis codice Varsoviensi atque de Andrea Taranowski et Theodosio Zygomala. Pp. 80; V plates. (Polska Akademia Umiejętności. Archiwum Filologiczne Nr 9.) Cracow etc.: Gebethner and Wolff, 1929. Paper, 6 Zloty.
- Usener* (H.) et *Radermacher* (L.) Dionysii Halicarnasei quae exstant. Volumen sextum. D. H. opuscula ediderunt H. U. et L. R. Vol. II fasc. posterior. Pp. xxix, and 389-420. Leipzig: Teubner, 1904-1929. Bound, RM. 3.60 (unbound, 3).
- van Wageningen* (J.) Latijnsch Woordenboek. Vierde Druk bewerkt door F. Muller. Pp. xv+1045. Groningen: Wolters, 1929. Cloth, f. 9.90.
- Way* (A. S.) The Aeneid of Virgil in English Verse. Vol. IV. Books X-XII. Pp. 165. London: Macmillan, 1930. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Woodhouse* (W. J.) The Composition of Homer's Odyssey. Pp. 251. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1930. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.
- Young* (Sir G.) Homer and the Greek Accents. Pp. viii+38. Reading: Poynder and Son, 1930. Buckram, 6s. post free.
- Ziegler* (K.) Thukydides und die Weltgeschichte. Pp. 21. (Greifswalder Universitätsschriften, 19.) Greifswald: L. Bamberg, 1928. Paper.



g.  
e  
t  
e  
n  
n  
of  
e.  
ty  
o-  
o-  
ka  
o-  
er  
sili  
m.  
R.  
89-  
nd,  
ek.  
v +  
bth,  
lish  
165.  
et.  
er's  
don  
ents.  
Son,  
ltge-  
ersi-  
berg,